THE CAMBRIDGE HEIDEGGER LEXICON

Martin Heidegger (1889–1976) was one of the most original thinkers of the twentieth century. His work has profoundly influenced philosophers including Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Hannah Arendt, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Jürgen Habermas, Charles Taylor, Richard Rorty, Hubert Dreyfus, Stanley Cavell, Emmanuel Levinas, Alain Badiou, and Gilles Deleuze. His accounts of human existence and being and his critique of technology have inspired theorists in fields as diverse as theology, anthropology, sociology, psychology, political science, and the humanities. This Lexicon provides a comprehensive and accessible guide to Heidegger's notoriously obscure vocabulary. Each entry clearly and concisely defines a key term and explores in depth the meaning of each concept, explaining how it fits into Heidegger's broader philosophical project. With over 220 entries written by the world's leading Heidegger experts, this landmark volume will be indispensable for any student or scholar of Heidegger's work.

Mark A. Wrathall is Professor of Philosophy at the University of Oxford and Fellow and Tutor of Corpus Christi College. He is the author of *Heidegger and Unconcealment: Truth, Language, and History* (Cambridge, 2011) and the editor of *Religion after Metaphysics* (Cambridge, 2003) and *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger's* Being and Time (Cambridge, 2013).

THE CAMBRIDGE
HEIDEGGER LEXICON

EDITED BY

Mark A. Wrathall
University of Oxford

Contents

Contributors

Jesús Adrián Escudero (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona)

Kevin Aho (Florida Gulf Coast University)

Charles Bambach (University of Texas at Dallas)

David Batho (University of Oxford)

Dana S. Belu (California State University Dominguez Hills)

Robert Bernasconi (Pennsylvania State University)

William Blattner (Georgetown University)

Lee Braver (University of South Florida)

Richard Capobianco (Stonehill College)

Taylor Carman (Barnard College, Columbia University)

David R. Cerbone (West Virginia University)

Antonio Cimino (Radboud University)

Benjamin Crowe (Boston University)

Steven Crowell (Rice University)

Daniel O. Dahlstrom (Boston University)

Bret W. Davis (Loyola University Maryland)

Christoph Demmerling (Friedrich-Schiller-Universität Jena)

Sharin N. Elkholy (University of Houston-Downtown)

David Espinet (Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg)

Ingo Farin (University of Tasmania)

James E. Faulconer (Brigham Young University)

Lauren Freeman (University of Louisville)

Gregory Fried (Boston College)

Kevin Gin (University of California, Riverside)

Trish Glazebrook (Washington State University)

Sacha Golob (King's College London)

Florian Grosser (California College of the Arts)

Michael Großheim (Universität Rostock)

Lucilla Guidi (Universität Hildesheim)

Charles Guignon (University of South Florida)

Rico Gutschmidt (Universität Konstanz)

Lawrence J. Hatab (Old Dominion University)

Andrew Inkpin (University of Melbourne)

Julia Ireland (Whitman College)

Christoph Jamme (Leuphana Universität Lüneburg)

Stephan Käufer (Franklin & Marshall College)

Tobias Keiling (Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität Bonn)

Pierre Keller (University of California, Riverside)

Alan Kim (Stony Brook University)

Theodore Kisiel (Northern Illinois University)

Adam Knowles (Drexel University)

Charlotte Knowles (University of Groningen)

Jo-Jo Koo (College of William and Mary)

Morganna Lambeth (Purdue University)

William Large (University of Gloucestershire)

Patrick Londen (University of California, Riverside)

Sebastian Luft (Marquette University)

Jeff Malpas (University of Tasmania)

Samantha Matherne (Harvard University)

Denis McManus (University of Southampton)

Nikola Mirkovic (Universität Koblenz-Landau)

Dermot Moran (Boston College & University College Dublin)

George Pattison (University of Glasgow)

Richard Polt (Xavier University)

James D. Reid (Metropolitan State University of Denver)

Sam Richards (University of California, Riverside)

Joseph Rouse (Wesleyan University)

B. Scot Rousse (University of California, Berkeley)

Hans Ruin (Södertörn University, Stockholm)

Theodore Schatzki (University of Kentucky)

Joseph K. Schear (University of Oxford)

Christian Schmidt (Universität Leipzig)

Matthew Shockey (Indiana University South Bend)

Sonia Sikka (University of Ottawa)

Jan Slaby (Freie Universität Berlin)

Mark Tanzer (University of Colorado Denver)

Iain Thomson (University of New Mexico)

Gerhard Thonhauser (Technische Universität Darmstadt)

Pol Vandevelde (Marquette University)

Daniel Watts (University of Essex)

David Webb (Staffordshire University)

Martin Weichold (Universität Regensburg)

Charlotta Weigelt (Södertörn University)

Justin F. White (Brigham Young University)

Katherine Withy (Georgetown University)

Mark A. Wrathall (University of Oxford)

Julian Young (Wake Forest University)

Michael E. Zimmerman (University of Colorado Boulder)

Preface

Martin Heidegger was one of the most influential and original thinkers of the twentieth century. His influence could be measured by the number and variety of other important philosophers who have been profoundly influenced by his work. They include German philosophers like Hannah Arendt, Hans-Georg Gadamer, and Jürgen Habermas; French philosophers like Jean-Paul Sartre, Simone de Beauvoir, Maurice Merleau-Ponty, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, and Emmanuel Levinas; and philosophers in the English-speaking tradition like Charles Taylor, Richard Rorty, Hubert Dreyfus and Stanley Cavell. Heidegger is a seminal figure in all of the most important movements in twentieth-century European philosophy – for instance, phenomenology, existentialism, post-structuralism, and deconstruction. One could also assess Heidegger's importance by the number of fields which have been shaped by his work: theorists in fields as diverse as theology, anthropology, sociology, psychology, aesthetics, political science, strategic management, and the humanities have turned to Heidegger for inspiration. But the most important gauge of Heidegger's significance as a thinker is the scope and profundity of his thought itself. Heidegger's work addresses the central topics of philosophy – being, language, human nature, the foundations of knowledge, the sources of human agency, the ethical challenges of life in a globalized and technologized culture, and so on. His writings on these topics continue to influence the development of philosophy into the twenty-first century.

Heidegger is also one of the most controversial thinkers of the twentieth century. Even leaving aside his embrace of National Socialism, his style of writing and his modes of argumentation have led some to dismiss his work as mysticism, obscurantism, and irrationalism. Even scholars specializing in the study of Heidegger's works struggle with his peculiar use of language. Heidegger coins new jargon, and he uses existing words in odd ways, redefining them in what he calls a "broad sense" (*weiten Sinne*) or a "being sense" (*Seinssinne*). Words used in a broad sense have an overlapping but significantly different extension than the everyday, familiar meaning of the term. Heidegger does this because he is interested in picking out things in terms of their ontological structure and function. Having done that, he then uses the term to apply to other things that share that ontological structure.

The results of this terminological practice can be very confusing. For example, we normally use the word "truth" to denote true propositional entities like assertions or beliefs. What makes true propositions true is that they perform a particular function – namely, they uncover a fact or state of affairs. Thus, Heidegger takes uncovering in a broad sense – lifting into salience – to be the ontological function of truth. He then applies the words "true" and "truth" in a broad sense to name anything which uncovers. So, for example, if I drive a nail into a board, I am uncovering the way a hammer is used. In this sense my action, for Heidegger, is "true" – it lifts into salience what a hammer is and how it is used. Or if a building like a medieval cathedral makes evident for the faithful what it means to inhabit a world opened up by God's grace, the cathedral is also "true" – it lifts into salience what is essential or most important about such a world.

Heidegger rarely offers a direct and explicit definition of the way he is using his word. One gets clued in to the ontologically broad meaning only by attending to the contexts in which it appears. Heidegger's terminology thus only gradually becomes clearer as one works and struggles to interpret his arguments and phenomenological descriptions. Much of the best secondary literature on Heidegger's philosophy consists precisely in trying to get clearer about the meaning of his words. The state of Heidegger scholarship has been advanced significantly over the last several decades by the ongoing publication of Heidegger's collected works, the *Gesamtausgabe* (GA). This has provided a wealth of context to round out our understanding of Heidegger's use of language.

Another feature of Heidegger's use of language is the way that he frequently draws inspiration from the structure and history of words. "The ultimate business of philosophy," Heidegger claims, "is to preserve the *force of the most elemental words* in which Dasein expresses itself, and to keep the common understanding from levelling them off to that unintelligibility which functions in turn as a source of pseudo-problems" (SZ 220). Heidegger frequently uncovers the "force of the most elemental words" of the German language by teasing out their etymological relationships with other words and concepts. Translating his work into English is thus complicated by the fact that the etymological relations for German terms are often not shared by their English counterparts.

As a result, there are significant obstacles to reading Heidegger in English translation – over and above the inherent complexity of his thought. The meaning of his most important or "elemental" words all too often departs from their ordinary sense, meaning that the reader has to be constantly alert to the danger of slipping back into understanding his terms in the familiar sense. There are significant variations in the way Heidegger's German terms are translated across works, and even within the same work.

My hope is that this volume will do something to remove these obstacles. I have made an effort to impose lexical consistency across the entire volume – at times at the cost of distressing the authors of the entries to this Lexicon. I have no interest in unduly suppressing disputes over translation – I believe such disputes are an extremely important way in which philosophy is done. Heidegger's work has given birth to a number of different schools of thought on how best to interpret his philosophy – schools that often disagree pointedly with each other. Contributors to this volume are drawn from across the broad spectrum of Heidegger scholarship in the English-speaking world (and beyond). The discerning reader will thus notice that the Lexicon presents a diversity of approaches to Heidegger's work.

I've tried, then, to strike a balance between clarity and openness to alternative translations. In addition to employing a uniform translation across this Lexicon, each entry begins with something akin to a definition of Heidegger's word before proceeding to a more nuanced discussion of the meaning and use of that term. Thus readers can use this Lexicon both for a quick reference while trying to decipher Heidegger's prose, but also as a means to dive more deeply into scholarship on Heidegger's philosophy. I've also encouraged authors to discuss in their entries ongoing disputes over translation (and many have done so).

Finally, I have made liberal use of "stub entries" that refer the reader to the main entry. For instance, there is an entry that reads:

Readiness-to-hand (zuhandenheit). See Availableness.

The reader of this Lexicon thus should be able to look up any of the leading alternative translations of a term and be led to the entry that discusses that term.

Acknowledgments

Using the Lexicon

Within entries, words that have their own separate entry in the Lexicon are formatted in small caps.

Most entries conclude with a "References in Heidegger" section that lists significant passages in Heidegger's work in which he discusses or helps to define the term in question. The references listed here are by no means exhaustive, and readers who want to continue their study of a term or concept in Heidegger's work are encouraged to consult François Jaran and Christophe Perrin's *The Heidegger Concordance*.

Quotations of Heidegger in this volume routinely modify the published translations. I have tried to provide a reference to English-language translations of Heidegger's works (where they exist). *But the reader should be alerted to the fact that the translations used in the Lexicon might differ from those translations.*

Citations of *Being and Time*, as is standard practice, refer to the pagination of the eighth German edition of *Sein und Zeit*, published by Verlag Max Niemeyer in 1957. These page numbers are found in the margins of both English-language translations of *Being and Time*, as well as in the margins of the *Gesamtausgabe* edition of *Sein und Zeit* (GA2) (Klostermann, 1977). Citations of *Being and Time* will use the abbreviation "SZ." The preferred translation of *Being and Time* is the translation by John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson (New York: Harper & Row, 1962). But, as noted above, many of the passages quoted from *Being and Time* have either modified the existing translations, or retranslated the original de novo.

References to other works by Heidegger will direct the reader to the *Gesamtausgabe* volume and pagination. Most newer translations of Heidegger's work include the *Gesamtausgabe* pagination in the margins, in the top header, or inserted into the text. Where this is the case, we will not generally list the page number of the translation, as the passage can be readily found by consulting the marginal numbers. Full bibliographic information for these English-language translations can be found below, included in the reference to the corresponding volume in the *Gesamtausgabe*.

When translations do not contain the marginal page numbers that refer to the *Gesamtausgabe* pagination, we will use both the *Gesamtausgabe* reference and a reference to the page number in translation. For example, *Pathmarks* – the English translation of *Wegmarken* (GA9) – does not include a *Gesamtausgabe* reference. So a reference to *Wegmarken* (GA9) will include the page number in GA9, followed by a slash and the page number in *Pathmarks* – like this: (GA9:112/89).

Some volumes of the *Gesamtausgabe* have not yet been translated and published as a whole volume, although select essays have been translated and published in essay collections. Where this is the case, the citation will include both a citation to the *Gesamtausgabe* and a citation to the English translation, using the abbreviations listed in the "Other English Translations" below. So a reference to Heidegger's essay "Aus einem Gespräch von der Sprache," published in German in GA12 and in English as "A Dialogue on

Language" in the essay collection *On the Way to Language*, will look like this: (GA12:104/ OWL 20).

Multiple translations exist for a number of Heidegger's works. Page references within entries will refer to the translation listed below in Abbreviations unless the author of the entry specified a preference for a different translation.

Chronology of Martin Heidegger

Sep. 26, 1889	Born to Friedrich and Johanna Heidegger (née Kempf) in Messkirch, Baden, Germany. His father was a sexton in the Catholic Church and a master cooper. Heidegger attends elementary and middle school in Messkirch.
1903–06	Receives a grant to enter the Konradihaus, the Catholic boys' Seminary in Constance, and attend Gymnasium.
1906–09	Receives a grant intended for those training in the priesthood; this allows him to attend the Berthold Gymnasium in Freiburg where he boards at the archiepiscopal seminary of St. Georg. Completes his final comprehensive examination in the summer of 1909.
Sep. 30, 1909	Enters the novitiate of the Society of Jesus at Tisis, Austria. He is dismissed for medical reasons on October 13, at the end of his two-week probation.
1909–11	Studies Catholic theology at the University of Freiburg.
1911–13	Studies natural sciences, mathematics, and philosophy at the University of Freiburg.
July 26, 1913	Defends his dissertation, "The Doctrine of Judgment in Psychologism: A Critical and Positive Contribution to Logic," completed under the supervision of Arthur Schneider. Heidegger passes his oral examination and is awarded the doctorate in philosophy, *summa cum laude*.
1913–15	Continues advanced study in philosophy at University of Freiburg while writing his habilitation dissertation, "The Doctrine of Categories and Meaning in Duns Scotus," under the direction of Heinrich Rickert.
July 28, 1914	First World War breaks out.
July 27, 1915	Receives his habilitation and is granted his license to teach in philosophy.
Aug. 18, 1915	Called up for military service in the German army, and assigned to serve as a postal censor in Freiburg.
1915–16	As a docent, Heidegger offers lectures and seminars at the University of Freiburg on ancient and scholastic philosophy, Kant's *Prolegomena*, and German Idealism.
1916–17	Offers lecture course on "The Basic Questions of Logic."
March 20, 1917	Marries Elfride Petri.
1918	Called up for training in meteorology and stationed near Sedan.
Nov. 11, 1918	Fighting ends between Germany and the Allied Powers.
Jan. 9, 1919	Writes to Father Engelbert Krebs to explain that "the *system* of Catholicism" is "problematic and unacceptable to me – but not Christianity and metaphysics" (BH 96).
Jan. 21, 1919	Son Jörg is born.

June 28, 1919	The Treaty of Versailles is signed, bringing an end to the First World War.
1919–20	Returns to lecturing as a docent at the University of Freiburg, offering courses and seminars on phenomenology (see GA56/57 and GA58). During this period, Heidegger becomes Husserl's assistant, holding "the phenomenological exercises of seminars in common with Husserl" (BH 108). He also befriends Karl Jaspers, and begins drafting a critical review of Jaspers's *Psychology of Worldviews*. This is first published in 1973, and republished in 1976 in the *Gesamtausgabe* edition of *Pathmarks* (see GA9).
Aug. 20, 1920	Son Hermann is born.
1920–23	Offers lecture courses and seminars that develop a phenomenological approach to lived experience (GA59), to religious life (GA60), to Augustine and Neoplatonism (GA60), to Aristotle (GA61 & GA62), and to ontology (GA63).
1923	Accepts associate professorship at the University of Marburg.
1923–24	Offers lecture courses on a phenomenological approach to ontology (GA17), and to Aristotle's account of human being (GA18). In this and subsequent years, his lectures at Marburg are attended by, among others, Hans-Georg Gadamer, Karl Löwith, Hannah Arendt, and Hans Jonas.
July 25, 1924	At Rudolf Bultmann's invitation, Heidegger lectures at the Marburg Theological Faculty on "The Concept of Time."
1924–25	Offers a lecture course on Aristotle's account of human understanding, and Plato's research into ontology (GA19). Hannah Arendt, then eighteen years old, attends the lecture course. In February 1925, Arendt and Heidegger become lovers.
April 16–21, 1925	Lectures on Wilhelm Dilthey at the Society for Art and Science of the Electorate of Hesse, at Kassel.
1925–26	Offers lecture courses on the phenomenology of time and human existence (GA20), truth and logic (GA21), and ancient approaches to ontology (GA22).
1926–27	Offers lecture courses on Aquinas, Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz, and Wolff (GA23), and on ontology and time (GA24).
1927	Publishes *Being and Time*.
July 8, 1927	Delivers the lecture "Phenomenology and Theology" in Tübingen, and again in Marburg on February 14, 1928. This is first published in 1969 and republished in 1976 in the *Gesamtausgabe* edition of *Pathmarks* (see GA9).
1927–28	Now a full professor, Heidegger teaches his last courses at Marburg, in which he develops a phenomenological interpretation of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* (GA25), and explores the metaphysical foundations of logic through an interpretation of Leibniz (GA26).
1928	Appointment as Professor of Philosophy at the University of Freiburg im Breisgau, succeeding Husserl.

1928–29	Offers a lecture course on science, truth, and the philosophy of world-view (GA27).
March 17–27, 1929	Delivers three lectures on "Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* and the Task of a Laying of the Ground for Metaphysics" at the Davos Hochschule. The lectures are followed by a disputation with Ernst Cassirer.
1929	Publishes *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* (GA3). He also publishes "On the Essence of Ground" in a Festschrift for Edmund Husserl; it is republished in *Pathmarks* (1967).
July 24, 1929	Delivers his inaugural public lecture at the University of Freiburg, entitled "What is Metaphysics?" It is published in 1929, and included in the first edition of *Pathmarks* (1967).
1929–30	Teaches lectures courses on German Idealism (GA28), and a monumental course on the fundamental attunement of boredom, the essence of animality, and the "world-forming" character of human existence (GA29/30).
July 14, 1930	Delivers the lecture "On the Essence of Truth" in Bremen. The lecture is later repeated in Marburg and Freiburg. It is included in the first edition of *Pathmarks* (1967).
1930–33	Teaches lecture courses on human freedom (GA31), Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* (GA32), Aristotle's *Metaphysics Θ* (GA33), Plato and truth (GA34), and Anaximander and Parmenides (GA35). During this time, he also lectures and teaches seminars on Augustine's view of time, and the principle of contradiction. Heidegger begins keeping a set of notebooks that he writes in periodically between 1930 and 1970. These are published posthumously as *Ponderings* (GA94–97), and are better known as the *Black Notebooks*.
Jan. 31, 1933	Adolf Hitler is appointed Chancellor of Germany.
March 23, 1933	The Enabling Act comes into effect, giving Hitler plenary powers.
April 21, 1933	Heidegger is elected Rector of the University of Freiburg, and subsequently oversees the *Gleichschaltung* or Nazification of the University.
May 3, 1933	Becomes a member of the National Socialist Party.
May 27, 1933	Delivers his inaugural Rectoral Address on "The Self-Assertion of the German University."
1933–34	Teaches lecture courses on metaphysics and truth (GA36/37).
Feb. 23, 1934	Publishes "Why Do I Stay in the Provinces?" (GA13), explaining his reasons for twice rejecting the prestigious offer of a professorship at the Humboldt University of Berlin.
April 23, 1934	Resigns the Rectorship of Freiburg University.
1934–35	Teaches lecture courses on language and human existence (GA38), Hölderlin's Hymns "Germania" and "The Rhine" (GA39), and on metaphysics and being (GA40).
Nov. 13, 1935	Lectures on "The Origin of the Work of Art" in Freiburg. Revised versions of the lecture are delivered in January 1936 (in Zurich), and on November 17 and 24, and December 4, 1936 (in Frankfurt am Main), before being published in *Off the Beaten Track* (1950).

1935–36	Teaches a lecture course on Kant's account of thinghood (published in 1962 under the title "What is a Thing?" GA41).
April 2, 1936	Delivers the lecture "Hölderlin and the Essence of Poetry" in Rome. This lecture is published in the journal *Das innere Reich* 3 (1936): 1065–78, and republished in *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry* (1944).
1936–37	Teaches lecture courses on Schelling's account of human freedom (GA42), and on Nietzsche's doctrine of the will to power and philosophy of art (GA43). Work starts, and continues through 1938, on the manuscript treatise *Vom Ereignis: Beiträge zur Philosophie* (GA65), published posthumously in 1989.
1937–38	Teaches lecture courses on Nietzsche's doctrine of the eternal recurrence (GA44), and on truth (GA45).
June 9, 1938	Delivers the lecture "The Founding of the Modern World Picture by Metaphysics" in Freiburg. The essay is later published as "The Age of the World Picture" in *Off the Beaten Track* (1950).
1938–39	Teaches lecture courses and seminars on Nietzsche's *Untimely Meditations* (GA46), on Nietzsche's doctrine of the will to power (GA47), and on language (GA85). During this time, Heidegger composes the manuscript treatises *Mindfulness* (GA66), and *Overcoming Metaphysics* (GA67), published posthumously. He begins work on two other treatises – *The History of Beyng* and *Koinon* (both in GA69).
Sep. 1, 1939	Germany invades Poland, marking the beginning of the Second World War.
1940–42	Teaches lecture courses and seminars on Nietzsche and nihilism (GA48), Schelling's metaphysics (GA49), being and human existence (GA51), Hölderlin's Hymn "Remembrance" (GA52), and Hölderlin's Hymn "The Ister" (GA53). Heidegger composes the manuscript treatise *On the Inception* (GA70).
1942	Publishes "Plato's Doctrine of Truth." It is later republished in the first edition of *Pathmarks* (1967).
1942–43	Teaches lecture courses on Parmenides (GA54) and Heraclitus (GA55). Heidegger also lectures on Hegel; parts of these lectures are later published as "Hegel's Concept of Experience" in *Off the Beaten Track* (1950). In 1943, Heidegger repeatedly delivers the lecture "Nietzsche's Word: 'God is Dead'"; it is later published in *Off the Beaten Track* (1950).
June 6, 1943	Delivers the lecture "Remembrance of the Poet" at the University of Freiburg im Breisgau. This lecture is published in *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry* (1944) under the title "Homecoming/To Kindred Ones."
1944	Teaches lecture course on Heraclitus' doctrine of the *Logos* and truth (GA55). Publishes the first edition of *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry* (GA4). This volume contains lectures on Hölderlin that Heidegger delivered in the 1930s and 1940s. Heidegger begins teaching a lecture course on the connection between thinking and poetry (GA50), but the course is interrupted when Heidegger is conscripted into the *Volkssturm* or German Territorial Militia on November 8, 1944.

November 27, 1944	British and American squadrons bomb Freiburg.
1944–45	Moves to Messkirch to organize and store his manuscripts. Composes a series of dialogues, published posthumously as *Country Path Conversations* (GA77).
May 7, 1945	Germany surrenders unconditionally to the Allies, ending the war in Europe.
July 23, 1945	Denazification Committee holds its first hearing on Heidegger's case.
Dec. 28, 1946	The French Military Government issues a final ruling that bars Heidegger from teaching and from all university activities. This ban remains in effect until 1949.
Fall 1946	Sends a letter to Jean Beaufret that is later published as the "Letter on 'Humanism,'" and republished in the first edition of *Pathmarks* (1967).
Dec. 1, 1949	Delivers a cycle of four lectures in Bremen under the collective title "Insight Into That Which Is" (GA79), including the lecture "The Thing," later published in *Vorträge und Aufsätze* (1954). The lectures are repeated on March 25 and 26, 1950, in Bühlerhöhe.
1950	Publishes *Off the Beaten Track* (GA5).
June 6, 1950	Delivers a lecture on "The Thing" in Munich. Later republished in *Vorträge und Aufsätze* (1954).
Oct. 7, 1950	Delivers the lecture "Language" in Bühlerhöhe. Later published in *On the Way to Language* (1959).
May 4, 1951	Delivers the lecture "*Logos*" to the Bremen Club. Published that same year, and later republished in *Vorträge und Aufsätze* (1954).
Aug. 5, 1951	Delivers the lecture "Building Dwelling Thinking" in Darmstadt, later republished in *Vorträge und Aufsätze* (1954).
Oct. 6, 1951	Delivers the lecture "… Poetically Man Dwells …" in Bühlerhöhe. Later republished in *Vorträge und Aufsätze* (1954).
Nov. 6, 1951	Holds a seminar in Zurich that touches on thought, poetry, science, technology, and the ontological difference (GA15).
1951–52	Resumes university teaching with his final lecture course at University of Freiburg: "What is Called Thinking?" (GA8). In May 1952, he delivers a portion of this lecture course on Bavarian Radio and publishes it later in *Vorträge und Aufsätze* (1954). The lecture course as a whole is published in 1954.
1953	Publishes his 1935 lecture course on the *Introduction to Metaphysics* (GA40) – the first of his Freiburg lecture courses selected for publication. Heidegger also publishes "Language in the Poem," later republished in *On the Way to Language* (1959).
May 18, 1953	Delivers the lectures "Who is Nietzsche's Zarathustra" in Bremen. Published later in *Vorträge und Aufsätze* (1954).
Aug. 4, 1953	Presents the paper "Science and Reflection" to a small group, in preparation for Heidegger's participation in a lecture series in Munich on "The Arts in the Technological Age." Published later in *Vorträge und Aufsätze* (1954).

Nov. 18, 1953	Delivers the lecture "The Question Concerning Technology" at the Bavarian Academy of Fine Arts in Munich as part of a series of lectures on "The Arts in the Technological Age" (published in 1954 in *Vorträge und Aufsätze*).
1954	Publishes *Vorträge und Aufsätze* (i.e., *Lectures and Essays*; see GA7). He also publishes *Aus der Erfahrung des Denkens* (translated in OWL as "The Thinker as Poet"), and *What is Called Thinking* (GA8) – his 1951–52 Freiburg lecture course.
1955	Publishes "On the Question of Being." Later republished in the first edition of *Pathmarks* (1967).
March 21, 1955	Delivers the lecture "Releasement" (*Gelassenheit*) in Cérisy-la-Salle, France.
Aug. 28, 1955	Delivers the lecture "What is Philosophy?" in Cérisy-la-Salle. It is later published in *Identity and Difference* (1957).
1955–56	Teaches a lecture course at the University of Freiburg under the title "The Principle of Ground" (GA10).
Feb. 24, 1957	Delivers the lecture "The Onto-theo-logical Constitution of Metaphysics" in Todtnauberg. It is later published in *Identity and Difference* (1957).
1957	Delivers, at the University of Freiburg, a series of lectures on the "Basic Principles of Thinking" (GA79). The lecture series includes "The Principle of Identity" which is published the same year in *Identity and Difference* (GA11), a collection of essays and lectures. Heidegger also publishes *The Principle of Ground* (GA10). He is admitted to the Heidelberg Academy of the Sciences and the Berlin Academy of Arts.
Dec. 4, 1957	Delivers the first of three lectures on "The Nature of Language" in Freiburg. The lecture cycle is completed on December 18, 1957 and February 7, 1958. The lectures are later published in *On the Way to Language* (1959).
May 11, 1958	Delivers a lecture on Stefan George's poem "The Word" in Vienna. The lecture is later published in *On the Way to Language* (1959).
July 26, 1958	Delivers the lecture "Hegel and the Greeks" in Heidelberg. It is later included in the first edition of *Pathmarks* (1967).
Jan. 1959	Delivers a series of lectures under the title "Language." One of these lectures is later published as "The Way to Language" in *On the Way to Language* (1959).
June 6, 1959	Delivers the lecture "Hölderlin's Earth and Heaven" in Munich. This lecture is published later in the fourth, enlarged edition of *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry* (1971).
1959	Publishes *On the Way to Language* (GA12), a collection of essays and lectures that date from the 1950s.
Sep. 8, 1959	Holds the first of many seminars and conversations with the psychiatrist Medard Boss, known as the Zollikon Seminars, at the University of Zurich. Subsequent seminars are held in 1964, 1965, 1966, and 1969 in Boss's home (GA89).

May 17, 1961	Delivers the lecture "Kant's Thesis about Being" in Kiel. It is later published in the first edition of *Pathmarks* (1967).
1961	Publishes the two-volume work *Nietzsche* (GA6.1 and GA6.2).
Jan. 31, 1962	Delivers the lecture "Time and Being" at the University of Freiburg. It is later published in *Zur Sache des Denkens* (1969).
Apr. 21–23, 1964	Jean Beaufret reads Heidegger's lecture "The End of Philosophy and the Task of Thinking" to a colloquium in Paris. The lecture is published later in *Zur Sache des Denkens* (1969).
Sep. 5–10, 1966	Holds a series of seminars on Parmenides and Heraclitus in Le Thor (GA15).
Sep. 23, 1966	Interviews with *Der Spiegel*. The interview is, at Heidegger's request, published posthumously (see GA16).
1966–67	Holds a seminar on Heraclitus with Eugen Fink at the University of Freiburg (GA15).
1967	Publishes *Pathmarks* (see GA9).
Aug. 25, 1968	Delivers the lecture "The Poem" in Munich. A revised version of this lecture is published later in the fourth, enlarged edition of *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry* (1971).
Aug. 30–Sep. 8, 1968	Holds a series of seminars in Le Thor on Hegel (GA15).
1969	Publishes *Zur Sache des Denkens* (*On the Matter of Thinking*, GA14).
Sep. 2–11, 1969	Holds a series of seminars in Le Thor on the question of being in Kant and the Greeks (GA15).
Apr. 10, 1970	Suffers a stroke.
Sep. 6–8, 1973	Holds a series of seminars in Zähringen on the question of being in Husserl and Parmenides (GA15).
1975	Publishes the first volume of his *Collected Works*, *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology* (GA24).
May 26, 1976	Dies in Freiburg.
May 28, 1976	Buried in Messkirch.

Abbreviations for Heidegger's Works

VOLUMES OF HEIDEGGER'S *GESAMTAUSGABE*

Information is included on English-language translations, where these are available. All *Gesamtausgabe* volumes are published in Frankfurt am Main by Klostermann.

Part I: Published Writings (1910–1976) / I. Abteilung: Veröffentlichte Schriften (1910–1976)

GA1   *Frühe Schriften* (1978).
- 1–15, "Das Realitätsproblem in der modernen Philosophie" (1912). Translated as: "The Problem of Reality in Modern Philosophy," trans. Philip J. Bossert, rev. Aaron Bunch, in BH 20–29.
- 17–43, "Neuere Forschungen über Logik" (1912). Translated as: "Recent Research in Logic," trans. Theodore Kisiel, in BH 31–44.
- 189–411, *Die Kategorien- und Bedeutungslehre des Duns Scotus* (1915). Translated as: *The Doctrine of Categories and Meaning of Duns Scotus*, trans. Joydeep Bagchee (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, forthcoming).
- 399–411, "Schluß: Das Kategorienproblem" (1916). Translated as: "Conclusion [to *Die Kategorien- und Bedeutungslehre des Duns Scotus*]: The Problem of Categories (1916)," trans. Roderick M. Stewart and John van Buren, in S 62–68.
- 413–33, "Der Zeitbegriff in der Geschichtswissenschaft" (1916). Translated as: "The Concept of Time in the Science of History," trans. Thomas Sheehan, in BH 61–72.

GA3   *Kant und das Problem der Metaphysik* (1991). Translated as: *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*, trans. Richard Taft (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997).

GA4   *Erläuterungen zu Hölderlins Dichtung* (1981). Translated as: *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry*, trans. Keith Hoeller (Amherst, NY: Humanity Books, 2000).

GA5   *Holzwege* (1977). Translated as: *Off the Beaten Track*, trans. Julian Young and Kenneth Haynes (Cambridge University Press, 2002). Selections also translated in BW, PLT, and QCT.

GA6.1   *Nietzsche* I (1996).
- 1–224 (= GA 43:3–274), "Der Wille zur Macht als Kunst" (1936–37). Translated as: "The Will to Power as Art," trans. David Farrell Krell, in N1 1–220.
- 225–423 (= GA 44:1–233), "Die ewige Wiederkehr des Gleichen" (1937). Translated as: "The Eternal Recurrence of the Same," trans. David Farrell Krell, in N2 1–208.

- 425–594 (= GA 47:1–295), "Der Wille zur Macht als Erkenntnis" (1939). Translated as: "The Will to Power as Knowledge," trans. Joan Stambaugh and David Farrell Krell, in N3 1–158.

GA6.2   *Nietzsche* II (1997).

- 1–22, "Die ewige Wiederkehr des Gleichen und der Wille zur Macht" (1939). Translated as: "The Eternal Recurrence of the Same and the Will to Power," trans. David Farrell Krell, in N3 159–83.
- 23–229 (= GA 48:1–332), "Der europäische Nihilismus" (1940). Translated as: "European Nihilism," trans. Frank A. Capuzzi, in N4 1–196.
- 231–300, "Nietzsches Metaphysik" (1940). Translated as: "Nietzsche's Metaphysics" (trans. Frank A. Capuzzi and David Farrell Krell), in N3 187–251.
- 301–61, "Die seinsgeschichtliche Bestimmung des Nihilismus" (1944–46). Translated as: "Nihilism as Determined by the History of Being," trans. Frank A. Capuzzi, in N4 199–250.
- 363–416, "Die Metaphysik als Geschichte des Seins" (1941). Translated as: "Metaphysics as History of Being," trans. Joan Stambaugh, in EP 1–54.
- 417–38, "Entwürfe zu Geschichte des Seins als Metaphysik" (1941). Translated as: "Sketches for a History of Being as Metaphysics," trans. Joan Stambaugh, in EP 55–74.
- 439–48, "Die Erinnerung in die Metaphysik" (1941). Translated as: "Recollection in Metaphysics," trans. Joan Stambaugh, in EP 75–83.

GA7   *Vorträge und Aufsätze* (2000).

- 5–36, "Die Frage nach der Technik" (1953). Translated as: "The Question Concerning Technology," trans. William Lovitt, in QCT 3–35. Another version, revised by David Farrell Krell, in BW 311–41.
- 37–65, "Wissenschaft und Besinnung" (1953). Translated as: "Science and Reflection," trans. William Lovitt, in QCT 155–82.
- 67–98, "Überwindung der Metaphysik" (1936–46). Translated as: "Overcoming Metaphysics," trans. Joan Stambaugh, in EP 84–110.
- 99–124. "Wer ist Nietzsches Zarathustra?" Translated as: "Who is Nietzsche's Zarathustra?" trans. David Farrell Krell, in N2 211–33.
- 145–64, "Bauen Wohnen Denken." Translated as: "Building Dwelling Thinking," trans. Albert Hofstadter, in PLT 145–61.
- 165–87, "Das Ding." Translated as: "The Thing," trans. Albert Hofstadter, in PLT 165–86.
- 189–208, "… dichterisch wohnet der Mensch …" Translated as: "… Poetically Man Dwells …," trans. Albert Hofstadter, in PLT 213–29.
- 211–34, "Logos (Heraklit, Fragment 50)." Translated as: "Logos (Heraclitus, Fragment B 50)," trans. David Farrell Krell and Frank A. Capuzzi, in EGT 59–78.
- 235–61, "Moira (Parmenides VIII, 34–41)." Translated as: "Moira (Parmenides VIII, 34–41)," trans. Frank A. Capuzzi, in EGT 79–101.
- 263–88, "Aletheia (Heraklit Fragment 16)." Translated as: "Aletheia (Heraclitus, Fragment B 16)," trans. Frank A. Capuzzi, in EGT 102–23.

GA8   *Was heißt Denken?* (2002). Translated as: *What is Called Thinking?* trans. Fred D. Wieck and J. Glenn Gray (New York: Harper & Row, 1968).

GA9   *Wegmarken* (1996). Translated as: *Pathmarks*, ed. William McNeill (Cambridge University Press, 1998). Selection also translated in BW.

GA10   *Der Satz vom Grund* (1997). Translated as: *The Principle of Reason*, trans. Reginald Lilly (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991).

GA11   *Identität und Differenz* (2006).
- 3–26, "Was ist das – die Philosophie?" (1955). Translated as: *What is Philosophy?* trans. Jean T. Wilde and William Kluback (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2003; originally New York: Twayne, 1958).
- 27–81, "Identität und Differenz" (1957). Translated as: "Identity and Difference," trans. Joan Stambaugh, in ID 21–76.
  - 31–50, "Der Satz der Identität" (1957). Translated as: "The Principle of Identity," trans. Joan Stambaugh, rev. Jerome Veith, in HR 284–94.
- 113–24, "Die Kehre" (1949). Translated as: "The Turning," trans. William Lovitt, in QCT 36–49.
- 125–40 (= GA 79:81–96), "Grundsätze des Denkens" (1957). Translated as: "Basic Principles of Thinking: Freiburg Lectures 1957, Lecture I," trans. Andrew J. Mitchell, in BFL 77–91.
- 143–52, "Ein Vorwort, Brief an Pater William J. Richardson" (1962). Translated as: "Preface" (trans. William J. Richardson), in William J. Richardson's *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1963), viii–xxii.

GA12   *Unterwegs zur Sprache* (1985).
- 7–30, "Die Sprache" (1950). Translated as: "Language," trans. Albert Hofstadter, in PLT 189–210.
- 33–78, "Die Sprache im Gedicht: Eine Erörterung von Georg Trakls Gedicht" (1952). Translated as: "Language in the Poem: A Discussion on Georg Trakl's Poetic Work," trans. Peter D. Hertz, in OWL 159–98.
- 81–146, "Aus einem Gespräch von der Sprache: Zwischen einem Japaner und einem Fragenden" (1953/54). Translated as: "A Dialogue on Language," trans. Peter D. Hertz, in OWL 1–54.
- 149–204, "Das Wesen der Sprache" (1957–58). Translated as: "The Nature of Language," trans. Peter D. Hertz, in OWL 57–108.
- 207–25, "Das Wort" (1958). Translated as: "Words," trans. Joan Stambaugh, in OWL 139–56.
- 229–57, "Der Weg zur Sprache" (1959). Translated as: "The Way to Language," trans. Peter D. Hertz, in OWL 111–36.

GA13   *Aus der Erfahrung des Denkens* (1983).
- 7, "Abendgang auf der Reichenau" (1916). Translated as: "Eventide on Reichenau," trans. William J. Richardson, in William J. Richardson's *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1963), 1.

- 9–13, "Schöpferische Landschaft: Warum bleiben wir in der Provinz?" (1933). Translated as: "Why Do I Stay in the Provinces?" trans. Thomas Sheehan, in Thomas Sheehan (ed.), *Heidegger: The Man and the Thinker* (Chicago: Precedent Publishing, 1981), 27–30.
- 35–36, "Chorlied aus der Antigone des Sophocles" (1943). Translated as: [The First Choral Ode from Sophocles' *Antigone*, lines 279–330], in Heidegger, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, trans. Gregory Fried and Richard Polt, 2nd rev. and expanded ed. (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2014), 156–58.
- 37–74, "Zur Erörterung der Gelassenheit. Aus einem Feldweggespräch über das Denken" (1944/45). Translated as: "Conversation on a Country Path about Thinking," trans. John M. Anderson and E. Hans Freund, in DT 58–90.
- 75–86, "Aus der Erfahrung des Denkens" (1947). Translated as: "The Thinker as Poet," trans. Albert Hofstadter, in PLT 1–14.
- 87–90, "Der Feldweg" (1949). Translated as: "The Pathway," trans. Thomas F. O'Meara, rev. Thomas Sheehan, in Thomas Sheehan (ed.), *Heidegger: The Man and the Thinker* (Chicago: Precedent Publishing, 1981), 45–67.
- 93–109, "Zu einem Vers von Mörike: Ein Briefwechsel mit Martin Heidegger von Emil Staiger" (1951). Translated as: "The Staiger-Heidegger Correspondence," trans. Arthur A. Grugan, in *Man and World* 14 (1981), 291–307.
- 111, "Was heißt Lesen?" (1954). Translated as: "What Is Reading?" trans. John Sallis, in John Sallis (ed.), *Reading Heidegger: Commemorations* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993), 2.
- 123–25, "Die Sprache Johann Peter Hebels" (1955). Translated as: "The Language of Johann Peter Hebel," trans. Jerome Veith, in HR 295–97.
- 133–50, "Hebel – der Hausfreund" (1957). Translated as: "Hebel – Friend of the House," trans. Bruce V. Foltz and Michael Heim, in Darrel E. Christensen (ed.), *Contemporary German Philosophy* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press, 1983), #3: 89–101.
- 185–98, "Adalbert Stifters 'Eisengeschichte'" (1964). Translated as: *Adalbert Stifter's "Ice Tale," by Martin Heidegger*, trans. Miles Groth (New York: Nino Press, 1993).
- 203–10, "Die Kunst und der Raum" (1969). Translated as: "Art and Space," trans. Jerome Veith, in HR 305–09.
- 221–24, "Gedachtes" (1970). Translated as: "Thoughts," trans. Keith Hoeller, in *Philosophy Today* 20/4 (1976), 286–90.
- 229, "Sprache" (1972). Translated as: "Language," trans. Thomas Sheehan, in *Philosophy Today* 20/4 (1976), 291.
- 231–35, "Der Fehl heiliger Namen" (1974). Translated as: "The Want of Holy Names," trans. Bernhard Radloff, in *Man and World* 18 (1985), 261–67.

GA14 *Zur Sache des Denkens* (2007).
- 3–104. Translated as TB.
  - 67–90. Also translated as: "The End of Philosophy and the Task of Thinking," trans. Joan Stambaugh, in BW 427–49.
- 129–32, "Brief an Edmund Husserl vom 22. Oktober 1927." Translated as: "Heidegger's Letter and Appendices," trans. Thomas Sheehan, in Edmund Husserl's *Psychological and Transcendental Phenomenology and the Confrontation with Heidegger (1927–1931)*, ed. and trans. Thomas Sheehan and Richard E. Palmer (Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1997), 136–39.
- 145–48, "Über das Zeitverständnis in der Phänomenologie und im Denken der Seinsfrage" (1968). Translated as: "The Understanding of Time in Phenomenology and in the Thinking of the Being-Question," trans. Thomas Sheehan and Frederick Elliston, in *Southwestern Journal of Philosophy* 10/2 (1979), 199–200.

GA15 *Seminare* (1986).
- 9–263, "Martin Heidegger – Eugen Fink: Heraklit." Translated as: *Heraclitus Seminar, 1966/67 with Eugen Fink*, trans. Charles H. Seibert, (Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 1979).
- 270–400, "Vier Seminare." Translated as: *Four Seminars*, trans. Andrew Mitchell and François Raffoul (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003).

GA16 *Reden und andere Zeugnisse eines Lebensweges, 1910–1976* (2000).
- 11–14, "Zur philosophischen Orientierung für Akademiker." Translated as: "On a Philosophical Orientation for Academics," trans. John Protevi, in BH 14–16.
- 49–51, "Wilhelm Diltheys Forschungsarbeit und der Kampf um eine historische Weltanschauung."
- 107–17, "Die Selbstbehauptung der deutschen Universität." Translated as: "The Self-Assertion of the German University," trans. Lisa Harries, in HR 108–16.
- 156, "Hier ist es leider sehr trostlos (22. August 1933)." Translated as: "Letter to Carl Schmitt" (translator unknown), in *Telos* 72 (1987), 132.
- 188–89, "Aufruf zur Wahl (10. November 1933)." Translated as: "German Men and Women!" trans. William S. Lewis, in HC 47–49.
- 190–93, "Ansprache am 11. November 1933 in Leipzig." Translated as: "Declaration of Support for Adolf Hitler and the National Socialist State (November 11, 1933)," trans. William S. Lewis, in HC 49–52.
- 232–37, "Zur Eröffnung der Schulungskurse für die Notstandsarbeiter der Stadt an der Universität (22. January 1934)." Translated as: "National Socialist Education (January 22, 1934)," trans. William S. Lewis, in HC 55–60.
- 238–39, "Der Ruf zum Arbeitsdienst (23. Januar 1934)." Translated as: "The Call to the Labor Service (January 23, 1934)," trans. William S. Lewis, in HC 53–55.
- 372–94, "Das Rektorat 1933/34 – Tatsachen und Gedanken" (1945). Translated as: "The Rectorate 1933/34: Facts and Thoughts," trans. Lisa

Harries, in Günter Neske and Emil Kettering (eds.), *Martin Heidegger and National Socialism* (New York: Paragon House, 1990), 15–32.

- 397–404, "Antrag auf die Wiedereinstellung in die Lehrtätigkeit (Reintegrierung – 4. November 1945)." Translated as: "Letter to the Rector of Freiburg University, November 4, 1945," trans. William S. Lewis, in HC 61– 66.
- 423–25, "Was ist das Sein selbst? (12. September 1946)." Translated as: "The Basic Question of Being as Such," trans. Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly, in *Heidegger Studies* 2 (1986), 4–6.
- 517–29, "Gelassenheit (30. Oktober 1955)." Translated as: "Memorial Address," trans. John M. Anderson and E. Hans Freund, in DT 43–57.
- 552–57, "Die Kunst und das Denken (18. Mai 1958)."
- 620–33, "Zur Frage nach der Bestimmung der Sache des Denkens (30. Oktober 1965)." Translated as: "On the Question Concerning the Determination of the Matter for Thinking," trans. Richard Capobianco and Marie Göbel, *Epoché* 14 (2010), 213–23.
- 652–83, "Spiegel-Gespräch mit Martin Heidegger (23. September 1966)." Translated as: "Der Spiegel Interview with Martin Heidegger," trans. Jerome Veith, in HR 313–33.
- 684–86, "Grußwort an das Heidegger-Symposium Chicago 11./12. November 1966 (20. Oktober 1966)." Translated as: "A Letter from Heidegger," trans. William J. Richardson, in Manfred S. Frings (ed.), *Heidegger and the Quest for Truth* (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1968), 19–21.
- 742–43, "Ein Grußwort für das Symposium in Beirut November 1974." Translated as: "A Greeting to the Symposium in Beirut in November 1974," trans. Lisa Harries, in Günter Neske and Emil Kettering (eds.), *Martin Heidegger and National Socialism* (New York: Paragon House, 1990), 253–54.
- 747–48, "Neuzeitliche Naturwissenschaft und moderne Technik – Grußwort an die Teilnehmer des zehnten Colloquiums von 14.–16. Mai 1976 in Chicago (11. April 1976)." Translated as: "Modern Natural Science and Technology," trans. John Sallis, in John Sallis (ed.), *Radical Phenomenology* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Humanities Press, 1978), 1–2.
- 761–63, "Die Universität im Neuen Reich (30. Juni 1933)." Translated as: "The University in the New Reich," trans. William S. Lewis, in HC 43–45.

Part II: Lectures (1919–1944) / II. Abteilung: Vorlesungen (1919–1944)

GA17   *Einführung in die phänomenologische Forschung* (1994). Translated as: *Introduction to Phenomenological Research*, trans. Daniel O. Dahlstrom (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2005).

GA18   *Grundbegriffe der Aristotelischen Philosophie* (2002). Translated as: *The Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy*, trans. Robert D. Metcalf (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009).

GA19   *Platon, Sophistes* (1992). Translated as: *Plato's Sophist*, trans. Richard Rojcewicz & Andre Schuwer (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997).

GA20   *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs* (1979). Translated as: *History of the Concept of Time: Prolegomena*, trans. Theodore Kisiel (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985).

GA21   *Logik: Die Frage nach der Wahrheit* (1976). Translated as: *Logic: The Question of Truth*, trans. Thomas Sheehan (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010).

GA22   *Die Grundbegriffe der antiken Philosophie* (1993). Translated as: *Basic Concepts of Ancient Philosophy*, trans. Richard Rojcewicz (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008).

GA23   *Geschichte der Philosophie von Thomas von Aquin bis Kant* (1976).

GA24   *Die Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie* (1975). Translated as: *Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, trans. Albert Hofstadter (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1982).

GA25   *Phänomenologische Interpretation von Kants Kritik der reinen Vernunft* (1977). Translated as: *Phenomenological Interpretation of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1997).

GA26   *Metaphysische Anfangsgründe der Logik im Ausgang von Leibniz* (1978). Translated as: *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, trans. Michael Heim (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1984).

GA27   *Einleitung in die Philosophie* (1996).

GA28   *Der deutsche Idealismus (Fichte, Schelling, Hegel) und die philosophische Problemlage der Gegenwart* (1997).

GA29/30   *Die Grundbegriffe der Metaphysik: Welt – Endlichkeit – Einsamkeit* (1983). Translated as: *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*, trans. William McNeill and Nicholas Walker (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995).

GA31   *Vom Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit: Einleitung in die Philosophie* (1982). Translated as: *The Essence of Human Freedom: An Introduction to Philosophy*, trans. Ted Sadler (London: Continuum, 2002).

GA32   *Hegels Phänomenologie des Geistes* (1980). Translated as: *Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. Parvis Emad and Kenneth Maly (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1988).

GA33   *Aristoteles, Metphysics Θ 1–3: Von Wesen und Wirklichkeit der Kraft* (1981). Translated as: *Aristotle's Metphysics Θ 1–3*, trans. Walter Brogan and Peter Warnek (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995).

GA34   *Vom Wesen der Wahrheit: Zu Platons Höhlengleichnis und Theätet* (1988). Translated as: *The Essence of Truth: On Plato's Cave Allegory and Theaetetus*, trans. Ted Sadler (London: Continuum, 2002).

GA35   *Der Anfang der abendländischen Philosophie: Auslegung des Anaximander und Parmenides* (2012). Translated as: *The Beginnings of Western Philosophy: Interpretation of Anaximander and Parmenides*, trans. Richard Rojcewicz (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2015).

GA36/37   *Sein und Wahrheit* (2001). Translated as: *Being and Truth*, trans. Gregory Fried and Richard Polt (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010).

GA38   *Logik als die Frage nach dem Wesen der Sprache* (1998). Translated as: *Logic as the Question Concerning the Essence of Language*, trans. Wanda Torres Gregory and Yvonne Unna (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2009).

GA39   *Hölderlins Hymnen »Germanien« und »Der Rhein«* (1980). Translated as: *Hölderlin's Hymns "Germania" and "The Rhine,"* trans. William McNeill and Julia Ireland (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2014).

GA40   *Einführung in die Metaphysik* (1983). Translated as: *Introduction to Metaphysics*, trans. Gregory Fried and Richard Polt (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2000).

GA41   *Die Frage nach dem Ding: Zu Kants Lehre von den transzendentalen Grundsätzen* (1984). Translated as: *What is a Thing?* trans. W. B. Barton, Jr. and Vera Deutsch (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1967). Also translated as *The Question Concerning the Thing*, trans. James D. Reid & Benjamin D. Crowe (London: Rowman & Littlefield, 2018).

GA42   *Schelling: Vom Wesen der menschlichen Freiheit* (1988).

GA43   *Nietzsche: Der Wille zur Macht als Kunst* (1985).

GA44   *Nietzsches metaphysische Grundstellung im abendländischen Denken: Die ewige Wiederkehr des Gleichen* (1986).

GA45   *Grundfragen der Philosophie: Ausgewählte "Probleme" der "Logik"* (1984). Translated as: *Basic Questions of Philosophy: Selected "Problems" of "Logic,"* trans. Richard Rojcewicz and Andre Schuwer (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994).

GA46   *Zur Auslegung von Nietzsches II. Unzeitgemäßer Betrachtung* (2003).

GA47   *Nietzsches Lehre vom Willen zur Macht als Erkenntnis* (1989).

GA48   *Nietzsche: Der europäische Nihilismus* (1986).

GA49   *Die Metaphysik des deutschen Idealismus (Schelling)* (1991).

GA50   *1. Nietzsches Metaphysik; 2. Einleitung in die Philosophie: Denken und Dichten* (1990). Part 2 translated as: *Introduction to Philosophy – Thinking and Poetizing*, trans. Phillip Jacques Braunstein (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011).

GA51   *Grundbegriffe* (1981). Translated as: *Basic Concepts*, trans. Gary E. Aylesworth (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1993).

GA52   *Hölderlins Hymne »Andenken«* (1982).

GA53   *Hölderlins Hymne »Der Ister«* (1984). Translated as: *Hölderlin's Hymn "The Ister,"* trans. William McNeill and Julia Davis (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1996).

GA54   *Parmenides* (1982). Translated as: *Parmenides*, trans. André Schuwer and Richard Rojcewicz (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1992).

GA55   *Heraklit: Der Anfang des abendländischen Denkens. Logik: Heraklits Lehre vom Logos* (1979). Translated as *Heraclitus*, trans. Julia Goesser Assaiante & S. Montgomery Ewegen (London: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2018).

GA56/57 *Zur Bestimmung der Philosophie* (1987). Translated as: *Towards the Definition of Philosophy*, trans. Ted Sadler (London: Continuum, 2002).

GA58   *Grundprobleme der Phänomenologie* (1993). Translated as: *Basic Problems of Phenomenology. Winter Semester 1919/1920*, trans. Scott M. Campbell (London: Bloomsbury, 2013).

GA59   *Phänomenologie der Anschauung und des Ausdrucks: Theorie der philosophischen Begriffsbildung* (1993).

GA60   *Phänomenologie des religiösen Lebens* (1995). Translated as: *The Phenomenology of Religious Life*, trans. Matthias Fritsch and Jennifer Anna Gosetti-Ferencei (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2004).

GA61   *Phänomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles: Einführung in die phänomenologische Forschung* (1985). Translated as: *Phenomenological Interpretations of Aristotle*, trans. Richard Rojcewicz (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2001).

GA62   *Phänomenologische Interpretationen ausgewählter Abhandlungen des Aristoteles zur Ontologie und Logik* (2005).

GA63   *Ontologie (Hermeneutik der Faktizität)* (1988). Translated as: *Ontology – The Hermeneutics of Facticity*, trans. John van Buren (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1999).

Part III: Unpublished Treatises. Presentations – Thoughts / III. Abteilung: Unveröffentlichte Abhandlungen. Vorträge – Gedachtes

GA64   *Der Begriff der Zeit* (2004). The first part is translated as: *The Concept of Time*, trans. Ingo Farin (London: Continuum, 2011). The second part is translated as: *The Concept of Time*, trans. William McNeill (Oxford: Blackwell, 1992).

GA65   *Beiträge zur Philosophie (vom Ereignis)* (1989). Translated as: *Contributions to Philosophy (of the Event)*, trans. Richard Rojcewicz and Daniela Vallega-Neu (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012).

GA66   *Besinnung* (1997). Translated as: *Mindfulness*, trans. Parvis Emad and Thomas Kalary (London: Continuum, 2006).

GA67   *Metaphysik und Nihilismus* (1999).

GA68   *Hegel* (2009). Translated as: *Hegel*, trans. Joseph Arel and Niels Feuerhahn (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2015).

GA69   *Die Geschichte des Seyns* (1998). Translated as: *The History of Beyng*, trans. William McNeill and Jeffrey Powell (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2015).

GA70   *Über den Anfang* (2005).

GA71   *Das Ereignis* (2009). Translated as: *The Event*, trans. Richard Rojcewicz (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2013).

GA73.1/73.2   *Zum Ereignis-Denken* (2013).

GA74   *Zum Wesen der Sprache und Zur Frage nach der Kunst* (2010).

GA75   *Zu Hölderlin: Griechenlandreisen* (2000).

GA76   *Leitgedanken zur Entstehung der Metaphysik, der neuzeitlichen Wissenschaft und der modernen Technik* (2009).

GA77   *Feldweg-Gespräche* (1995; 2nd ed. 1997). Translated as: *Country Path Conversations*, trans. Bret W. Davis (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2010; rev. ed. 2016).

GA78   *Der Spruch des Anaximander* (2010).

GA79   *Bremer und Freiburger Vorträge* (1994). Translated as: *Bremen and Freiburg Lectures: "Insight Into That Which Is" and "Basic Principles of Thinking,"* trans. Andrew J. Mitchell (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012).

GA81   *Gedachtes* (2007).

Part IV: Notes and Sketches / IV. Abteilung: Hinweise und Aufzeichnungen

GA85   *Vom Wesen der Sprache: Zu Herders Abhandlung »Über den Ursprung der Sprache«* (1999). Translated as: *The Metaphysics of Language and the Essencing of the Word: Concerning Herder's Treatise On the Origin of Language*, trans. Wanda Torres Gregory and Yvonne Unna (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2004).

GA86   *Seminare: Hegel – Schelling* (2011).

GA87   *Nietzsche: Seminare 1937 und 1944* (2004).

GA88   *Seminare (Übungen) 1937/38 und 1941/42* (2008).

GA89   *Zollikoner Seminare* (2017).

GA90   *Zu Ernst Jünger* (2004).

GA94   *Überlegungen II–VI* (2014). Translated as: *Ponderings II–VI: Black Notebooks 1931–1938*, trans. Richard Rojcewicz (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2016).

GA95   *Überlegungen VII–XI* (2014). Translated as: *Ponderings VII–XI: Black Notebooks 1938–1939*, trans. Richard Rojcewicz (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2017).

GA96   *Überlegungen XII–XV* (2014).

GA97   *Anmerkungen II–V* (2015).

OTHER ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS

AM   *Aristotle's Metaphysics Θ 1–3*, trans. Walter Brogan and Peter Warnek (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995).

BFL   *Bremen and Freiburg Lectures*, trans. Andrew J. Mitchell (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012).

BH   *Becoming Heidegger: On the Trail of His Early Occasional Writings, 1910–1927*, ed. Theodore Kisiel and Thomas Sheehan (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2007).

BT   *Being and Time*, trans. John Macquarrie and Edward Robinson (New York: Harper & Row, 1962).

BW   *Basic Writings*, rev. edn, ed. David F. Krell (San Francisco: Harper, 1993).

DT   *Discourse on Thinking*, trans. John M. Anderson and E. Hans Freund (New York: Harper & Row, 1966).

EGT   *Early Greek Thinking*, trans. David Farrell Krell and Frank A. Capuzzi (San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1975).

EHP   *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry*, trans. Keith Hoeller (Amherst, NY: Humanity Books, 2000).

EP   *The End of Philosophy*, trans. Joan Stambaugh (University of Chicago Press, 1973).

FS   *Four Seminars*, trans. Andrew Mitchell and François Raffoul (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2003).

HC   Richard Wolin (ed.), *The Heidegger Controversy* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1991).

HR   *The Heidegger Reader*, ed. Günter Figal (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2009).

HS   *Heraclitus Seminar*, trans. Charles H. Seibert (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 1979).

ID   *Identity and Difference*, trans. Joan Stambaugh (University of Chicago Press, 2002).

IM   *An Introduction to Metaphysics*, trans. Ralph Manheim (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1959).

LH   "A Letter from Heidegger," trans. William J. Richardson, in Manfred S. Frings (ed.), *Heidegger and the Quest for Truth* (Chicago: Quadrangle, 1968).

N1   *Nietzsche* I, trans. David Farrell Krell (New York: Harper & Row, 1979).

N2   *Nietzsche* II, trans. David Farrell Krell (New York: Harper & Row, 1984).

N3   *Nietzsche* III, trans. Joan Stambaugh, David Farrell Krell, and Frank A. Capuzzi (New York: Harper & Row, 1987).

N4   *Nietzsche* IV, trans. Frank A. Capuzzi (New York: Harper & Row, 1982).

NHS   *Nature, History, State 1933–1934*, trans. Gregory Fried and Richard Polt (London: Bloomsbury, 2013).

OTB   *On Time and Being*, trans. Joan Stambaugh (University of Chicago Press, 1972).

OWL   *On the Way to Language*, trans. Peter D. Hertz (NewYork: Harper & Row, 1971).

P   *Pathmarks*, ed. William McNeill (Cambridge University Press, 1998).

PLT   *Poetry, Language, Thought*, trans. Albert Hofstadter (New York: HarperCollins, 1971).

QCT   *The Question Concerning Technology and Other Essays*, trans. William Lovitt (New York: Harper & Row, 1977).

QDMT   "On the Question Concerning the Determination of the Matter for Thinking," trans. Richard Capobianco and Marie Göbel, in *Epoché* 14/2 (2010), 213–23.

S   *Supplements: From the Earliest Essays to Being and Time and Beyond*, ed. John van Buren (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2002).

SZ   *Sein und Zeit* (Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1927).

TB   *On Time and Being*, trans. Joan Stambaugh (New York: Harper & Row, 1972).

WCT   *What is Called Thinking?*, trans. J. Glenn Gray (New York: Harper Torchbook, 1968).

WP   *What is Philosophy?* trans. William Kluback and Jean T. Wilde (New York: Twayne, 1958).

WT   *What is a Thing?*, trans. W. B. Barton, Jr. and Vera Deutsch (Chicago: Henry Regnery, 1967).

Z   *Zollikoner Seminare: Protokolle – Gespräche – Briefe*, ed. Medard Boss (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1987). Translated as *Zollikon Seminars*, trans. Franz Mayr and Richrd Aksay (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press, 2001).

OTHER WORKS

1983.   *Die Selbstbehauptung der deutschen Universität: Das Rektorat 1933–34*, ed. Hermann Heidegger (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann).

1987.   'Letter of Aug. 22, 1933, Heidegger to Schmitt,' trans. G. L. Ulmen, *Telos* 72.

1989a.   *Martin Heidegger–Elisabeth Blochmann. Briefwechsel 1918–1969*, ed. Joachim W. Storck (Marbach am Neckar: Deutschen Literaturarchiv).

1989b.   "Phänomenologische Interpretationen zu Aristoteles (Anzeige der hermeneutischen Situation)." *Dilthy-Jahrbuch für Philosophie und Geschichte der Geisteswissenschaften* 6: 235–269. Translated as "Phenomenological Interpretations in Connection with Aristotle: An Indication of the Hermeneutical Situation (1922)," trans. John van Buren, in Martin Heidegger, *Supplements. From the Earliest Essays to Being and Time and Beyond*, ed. John van Buren (New York: SUNY Press, 2002), 111–145.

1991.   "Die Bedrohung der Wissenschaft," in *Zur philosophischen Aktualität Heideggers*, vol. 1: *Philosophie und Politik*, ed. D. Papenfuss and Otto Poeggeler (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1991), 5–27.

1994a.   "Die Armut" (1945), *Heidegger Studies* 10:5–11.

1994b.   *Besinnung auf unser Wesen* (Frankfurt am Main: Jahresgabe der Martin-Heidegger-Gesellschaft).

1995.   "Über das Prinzip 'Zu den Sachen selbst,'" *Heidegger Studies* 11 (1995).

2000.   *Contributions to Philosophy*, trans. Parvis Emad and Ken Maly (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

2005a.   *"Mein liebes Seelchen!" Briefe Martin Heideggers an seine Frau Elfride, 1915–1970*, ed. Gertrud Heidegger (Munich: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt); trans. as: *Martin Heidegger: Letters to his Wife, 1915–1970*, trans. R.D.V. Glasgow (Cambridge: Polity, 2008).

2005b.   *Übungen für Anfänger: Schillers Briefe über die ästhetische Erziehung des Menschen, Wintersemester 1936/37 Seminar-Mitschrift von Wilhelm Hallwachs*, ed. Ulrich von Bülow (Marbach am Neckar: Deutsche Schillergesellschaft).

2010.   "On the Question Concerning the Determination of the Matter of Thinking," trans. Richard Capobianco and Marie Göbel, *Epoché* 14: 213–23.

A

1.
ABANDONMENT OF BEING
(*SEINSVERLASSENHEIT*)

A BANDONMENT OF BEING means at the same time both our abandoning being by covering up being as a condition that lets being be, and (reading the genitive the other way) it also means the abandonment of us *by* being as being withdraws from us. Since everything we do is really a response to being, these two add up to pretty much the same thing for Heidegger. Being has abandoned us by abandoning entities, a strange idea since we and entities always have to have being as long as we are. The best way to approach this idea is to see it as an adaptation of a central notion in Kant's and Husserl's thought. Perhaps the main insight in Kant's first *Critique* and Husserl's work in general is that despite how it appears, we don't just open our eyes and find reality laid out before us, imposing itself on our consciousness by bumping into us; this kind of empiricist realism amounts to naiveté or dogmatism. Their discovery was that a great deal goes into the having of an experience, much of it on the part of consciousness. For us to perceive an object for Kant, the transcendental faculties must organize sensory data, giving it qualities such as time, space, causality, and objectivity. For Husserl, transcendental subjectivity stitches together an array of adumbrations or sides into a unified entity, thus conferring upon it the status of a single, persistent, independently existing object. We see many-sided objects instead of a series of discrete sides – indeed, we see them as *sides* at all – because we fuse them together, like squeezing used slivers of soap into a single transcendental bar. Sides are, so to speak, intentional: sides are always sides *of* something, and it is our transcendental constitution of the object that attaches them to it as sides of it. For both, what seems to lie before us as a gift is largely a product of our own unconscious labor.

Being and Time largely follows this strategy, albeit with important changes. DASEIN opens the CLEARING – the condition for the possibility of experiencing anything – by being-in-a-world; this in turn takes place on the basis of her caring for herself, which is ultimately made possible by her TEMPORALITY. Although, like Kant's processing, this largely takes place without our conscious control, rather like our autonomic nervous system or our fabrication of our own dreams, it is still our doing. On the other hand, like Husserl's active syntheses, we can exert some control over the process: when we still our unthinking use of a tool to stare at it, we change its mode of being from AVAILABLE to OCCURRENT. These modes of being correlate with, and are the result of, our stance toward entities and are ultimately due to features of our nature. (See Blattner 1999 for a detailed presentation of this reading.) This is one reason why the foundation of ONTOLOGY lies in the existential analytic, i.e., the analysis of Dasein's way of being.

Although Heidegger's critiques of his early work are often more exculpatory than critical, a fairly consistent thread objects to how subjectivistic and transcendental they are. He often limits the critique to his choice of terminology for suggesting such an interpretation to careless readers while denying that it is correct, but these excuses generally rely on what strike me as

implausible, "violent" reworkings of what he actually wrote, forcing it into alignment with his contemporary views.

In any case, Heidegger in his later works sees this entire line of thinking – from Descartes through Kant to Nietzsche, with roots reaching back to Plato – as "FORGETFULNESS OF BEING."

> Human beings continually have to do with being, and yet it is alien to them. They have to do with being inasmuch as they constantly relate to entities, but it is alien to them inasmuch as they turn away from being, because they do not grasp it at all; instead, they believe that entities are only entities and nothing further (GA40:139/ 138).

We cover up being with a realism that ignores the conditions that make awareness possible: "light never first creates the clearing. Rather, light presupposes it" (GA14:81/BW 442). Or, in the modern era, we ourselves take credit for the existence and nature of the entities around us, or at least our awareness of them: "the illusion comes to prevail that everything man encounters exists only insofar as it is his construct" (GA7:28/BW 332). This idealist/technological stance ignores the fact that we can only become aware of things if being "sends" us a clearing, i.e., gives us this capacity. We do not open up the clearing; we are given or thrown into it. All attempts to explain entities or to discover their BEINGNESS (i.e., the universal characteristics that define reality) – that is, METAPHYSICS – abandons being by taking either entities (in realism) or ourselves (in idealism) as the self-sufficient grounds of reality and awareness, ignoring what makes them possible in turn.

However, Heidegger stresses that this erring is not our fault; it is due to being itself. Our abandonment of being is conditioned by its abandoning of us, leading us to the opposed-with-shared-origin errors of thinking that either "entities are only entities and nothing further" or "everything man encounters exists only insofar as it is his construct." We find these ideas plausible because being withdraws by its very nature. In unconcealing entities, this very event of UNCONCEALMENT is itself concealed. Being, the event of manifestation, deflects our attention onto the things that are manifest. We don't think about the fact that a pen is or that we can experience it, for example; we just pick it up and write. "The abandonment of entities by being means that BEYNG *conceals itself* in the manifestness of entities. And beyng itself is essentially determined as this self-withdrawing concealment" (GA65:111). This is no accident; it is the nature of being to love to hide, as Heraclitus says. Being doesn't conceal itself *behind* entities, but *in* their appearance to us, *as* this very appearing.

In this way, Heidegger's later analysis of the abandonment of being can still be seen as combating something like transcendental dogmatism or phenomenological naiveté, but no longer by appealing to consciousness or Dasein. "The abandonment of entities by being gives them the appearance that they themselves, without needing anything else, are now there to be grasped and used. . . . Entities then appear *in that way*, namely as objects and as things objectively present, as if beyng were not occurring essentially" (GA65:115). It is naive to think that entities are just there and impinge upon our awareness when they knock into us, but it is equally naive to think that it is we who have prepared the way for them to become manifest to us, the way Kant, Husserl, and, I believe, early Heidegger did. Metaphysics exacerbates abandonment by giving answers to the question of being: "where . . . entities as entities have become obvious (and consequently the

question of being is merely a pursuit of 'ontology' as a fixed discipline), then no one thinks to ask how entities as entities come into the open and what this opening might be, and how it takes place.... The abandonment by being is consoled by the absence of the question of truth" (GA45:198/170).

However, as Heidegger likes to quote Hölderlin, the danger also contains the saving power (GA7:29/BW 333, GA11:119/QCT 42). In the word "*Seinsverlassenheit*" we find the word "*lassen*," to let. This is a very important word in Heidegger's later work; he even says that, "the deepest meaning of being is *letting*. Letting the being be, this is the non-causal meaning of 'letting'" (GA15:363/FS 59). Being lets entities be by opening up a clearing that lets entities through to our thinking. This helps us reconceive the nature of thinking as something fundamentally receptive, instead of the transcendental tradition's emphasis on activity – constituting, organizing, synthesizing, bestowing. "With the relation of letting-presence to ALÊTHEIA, the whole question about the being of entities is removed from the Kantian framework of the constitution of objects" (GA14:56/OTB 46). We receive an understanding that being lets us have, that lets through entities and lets us understand them, one that lets us make sense of and encounter entities. All activity takes place on the basis of this prior receptivity.

The proper attitude for us to take to this fundamental enabling is what he calls in *Being and Time* (in a different context) a "reciprocative rejoinder" (SZ 386). Whereas being lets entities come to presence, we can let being itself come to presence by thinking about this event, so that "the essence, the coming to presence, of being enters into its own emitting of light" (GA11:121/QCT 45; see also GA14:84–5/BW 445). At its best, our thinking reflects, re-enacts being in that we reveal the revelation: "originary thinking is the echo of being's favor, of a favor in which a singular event is cleared and lets come to pass: that entities are" (GA9:310/236). That is why our "letting entities be, is the fulfillment and consummation of the essence of truth in the sense of the disclosure of entities" (GA9:190/BW 127): we disclose the disclosure. Letting be or RELEASEMENT (*Gelassenheit*) is the great Aristotelian virtue of Heidegger's later thought: it is when we are most ourselves and when we are our best selves. Cultivating this attending to and tending of the event which lets being let entities be – what he calls being the shepherd or tender of being – is our proper ("*eigentlich*") response and responsibility.

If this turning comes to pass, our contemporary NIHILISM and "desolation" (another sense of *Verlassenheit*) may turn away by turning itself inside out, turning abandonment (*Verlassenheit*) into releasement (*Gelassenheit*), the danger into the saving power. This is not something we can do on our own, nor is it a simple switch. We cannot solve the problem by just turning our attention to being; it must show itself to us and it always does so in a partially concealing way. Our task in this desolate time is to become aware of and train our attention on the fact that being has withdrawn and abandoned us, which may prepare for its favoring us once more. If we can realize that our present desolation is itself sent by being, this would point us toward being as the giver of all SENSE, thus curing our transcendental narcissism and resulting cosmic loneliness (another possible translation of *Verlassenheit*). This changes the early existential thrownness from an abandonment in life to the granting of a clearing. We have been granted this miraculous opportunity to receive the manifestation of reality, and standing within even a desolate clearing should fill us with awe-filled gratitude. We need to stop taking for granted that which has been granted to us. Being grateful for our nihilistic epoch is the beginning of the turning of that

nihilism into a meaning-ful understanding of being, which is what I think Heidegger means by the return of the gods. Although being withdraws, if we embraced its withdrawal, it would no longer be an abandonment.

Lee Braver

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 2–4; GA8; GA65:10–2; GA40:139/138; GA66:90; GA45:184–90

ABIDE, ABIDING (*WEILEN*). SEE LINGERING.

2.
ABILITY-TO-BE (*SEINKÖNNEN*)

AN ABILITY-TO-BE is the capacity to inhabit a particular range of possibilities. It involves possessing the understanding, skills, and affective inclination to pursue these possibilities. Ability-to-be defines DASEIN's own relation to its being. Each Dasein has its own ability to be. It cannot be separated from Heidegger's explanation of Dasein's being as existence, and in particular the latter's characterization as POSSIBILITY.

The concept of an ability-to-be belongs to the period of *Being and Time* and the lectures that come before and just after it. Heidegger very rarely uses this expression in his later work. It is part of his reappropriation of Aristotle's ontology for the analytic of Dasein. It can be interpreted as his translation of the Greek *dunamis*. Of course, this is a creative repetition of Aristotle's original vocabulary. What Heidegger means by "ability-to-be" is not exactly the same as what Aristotle meant by *dunamis*. One very important difference, so as to stress the singular ontological nature of Dasein, whose being is an issue for it, is that Heidegger prioritizes the possible over the actual, whereas in Aristotle the relation is the other way around. "Higher than actuality," Heidegger writes in the introduction to *Being and Time*, "stands *possibility*" (SZ 38). He can do so, because possibility is not defined here in a logical or formal sense, as merely the opposite to necessity, but ontologically as a specific way of being of Dasein.

Dasein is, but not as some 'thing' either OCCURRENT or AVAILABLE. No doubt, Dasein can be understood as a thing but this is not primarily how Dasein is. The selfhood of Dasein is not a substance, even some kind of mysterious one. It is the drama of existence. This is why it can make sense to say I have lost or gained myself, or I am not truly myself. Each Dasein is uniquely itself, and in each Dasein the world is born again in terms of possibility. Ability-to-be names the individualization of each Dasein, how each one of us has to answer the question of existence, and why the being of Dasein is always "mine" (SZ 232). This is why, when Heidegger speaks of an ability-to-be, he usually adds "own" or "ownmost" (*eigen*, *eigenste*). Yet, in a certain sense, these expressions are redundant, for an ability-to-be is always "owned" in some way or another, even if it is "disowned."

Dasein relates to its being. It does so because its being is a question for it, even if this question remains unanswered. Its being is its possibilities, and it relates to them through the UNDER-STANDING. "Understanding" in English has far too much a cognitive flavor for what Heidegger means by *das Verstehen*. For a start I do not relate to my possibilities by thinking about them. They are revealed to me through my moods. When you meet someone and ask "how are you?" you are asking them about their mood, and how or what they reply, verbally or not, reveals to you their possibilities. Most of the time, of course, I do not answer this question sincerely, so nothing of my world is revealed to me, or to the other who asked me this question.

This is why, when Heidegger speaks of an ability-to-be, the question of AUTHENTICITY and inauthenticity is never far behind, since in being my ownmost potentiality for being, I am authentic, and in not, inauthentic. Heidegger stresses that this distinction is not a moral one, even though the translation tends to push in that direction. It belongs to the very being of

Dasein that it understands its possibilities in terms of how everyone else does. This is not a failure or a lack on my part. To understand myself in terms of my own possibilities, to seize the possibilities that have fallen to me, and to have the courage to be who I already was (all ways of making sense of an ability-to-be), can only be a modification of inauthentic existence.

One's ownmost ability-to-be cannot be separated from ANXIETY and DEATH. In anxiety, I am not fearful of this or that possibility, but the possible as such. This does not mean I am anxious of all my possibilities, but my existence as a whole out of which all my possibilities emerge. My existence is not this or that thing, but quite literally "nothing at all," which Heidegger describes as my "null-being" (SZ 305). To face the meaning of one's existence out of this experience of "meaninglessness," is to become aware of one's own "being-toward-death." Death, in this sense, is not a fact or actuality, but my death as a possibility, which is ever-present but I cannot foresee. This death is the impossibility of every possibility, and in confronting it I have the option of choosing my own ability-to-be, whatever that might be for me, rather than just living the life of everyone else, which I have not decided.

With his emphasis on one's ownmost ability-to-be, one might accuse Heidegger of reducing existence to a solipsism. To this accusation he answers, in the lectures *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic*, that this would be again to confuse an ontological distinction with a moral one, as though it were a fault of Dasein that it had to choose its own way of being, as opposed to not choosing itself and putting others before itself. Of course, one way in which Dasein could individuate itself would be to put others before itself, but this moral choice is only possible because of the ontology of Dasein and not the other way around. As when, for example, in *Being and Time*, Heidegger describes two ways of being with others, one in which we free them for their own possibilities, and the other, where we attempt to overpower and control them (SZ 122).

William Large

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 86, 122, 143–45, 188, 191–94, 221, 231–33, 250–52, 287–88, 336–37; GA9:157/121, 168–69/129–30; GA18:224; GA20:422, 433; GA21:219, 236, 412–14; GA22:140–41; GA24:242, 390, 409, 418; GA26:239, 266, 276; GA89:208–9

FURTHER READING

Blattner 1996, Carter 2014, McNeill 2009, Volpi 1996

ABODE (*AUFENTHALT*). SEE SOJOURN.

3.
ABYSS (*ABGRUND*)

A N ABYSS IN general is something that cannot be fathomed – that is, a phenomenon that defeats any effort to explain, determine, define, rationalize it, or make it intelligible using conceptual resources. Heidegger also uses "abyss" as a term of art to refer to a specific and important type of abyss in the more general sense. "Abyss" in Heidegger's specific sense is something that grounds the BEING of a thing precisely by refusing to determine it. Heidegger often indicates that he is using "abyss" in this specific sense by hyphenating the term ("a-byss," *Ab-grund*)[1], or by referring to it as an "abyssal ground" (*abgründige Grund*). A true decision or a free act, the genuine beginning of a new historical age – such things are constituted as what they are by the lack of any fully determining antecedent. Thus, the ground or reason for their being what they are is that they lack a determinate ground or reason. As Heidegger puts it in perhaps his clearest definition of an abyss in the special sense, an "a-byss" (*Ab-grund*) is

> that which releases into its essence what is groundable, but in such a way that that which is doing the releasing refuses itself and thereby denies to the grounding anything occurrent, or a reference to or insistence on anything occurrent. Instead, it gives to it the necessity of decision (GA69:98).

When we experience an abyss in this specific, ontological sense (that is, an abyss as defining the being of something), it is not merely something negative. It doesn't simply present us with a failure of our ability to understand or define or make sense of the world. Instead, it has an "existential positivity" (GA20:402). It is a positive determining feature of some things that the reason they are what they are is that they are lacking in reasons or foundations: "the ground grounds as a-byss" (*Der Grund gründet als Ab-grund*, GA65:29).

Heidegger makes frequent use of "abyss" in the generic sense, that is, to describe things that resist being explained or made intelligible in conceptual terms. The SENSE of being is an abyss (SZ 152). Philosophy at its most fundamental level "necessarily moves in an abyss" (GA28:310), because it lacks secure foundations for its arguments or theories. TIME (GA29/30:220) is an abyss that can never be conceptually grasped (later, Heidegger explores at some length the idea that time-space is an abyss in the more specific sense; see GA43:287; GA65:371–88). Animals are separated from humans by an abyss (GA29/30:384) because we lack the experience and categories necessary to fully understand the animal's impoverished relationship to its world. Non-being and the NOTHING are abysses – they resist our best efforts to make sense of them (GA40:118/116). Given that LANGUAGE offers us the conceptual resources we ordinarily draw

---

[1] By hyphenating it, Heidegger can indicate that the abyss is, *as* an abyss, also offering a ground in some sense. The root word – "byss" comes from the Greek *bussos* or *bathos* – means literally the bottom of the sea, but figuratively a substance that grounds perceptible attributes but is never itself directly perceived.

on to make everything else intelligible, it is perhaps surprising that Heidegger argues that language, too, is an abyss in the generic sense. While allowing us to explain other things, it itself resists being made intelligible to us (see GA12:11/PLT 189; GA11:48/HR 293). This is in part because "between the unintelligible word and the mere sound grasped in acoustic abstraction lies an abyss of essential difference" (GA8:88/130).

Heidegger invokes the idea of an abyss as an abyssal ground in the specific sense at various key points in his work. We've already noted that Heidegger holds that FREEDOM (GA9:174/134; GA65:438; GA66:237), decision (GA65:470), and historical beginnings (GA70:10ff.) are all constituted by the fact that their ground is an abyss. Creativity also is constituted by an abyss, as the creator gives birth to something new, and thus is constituted by the relationship to a lack of antecedents (GA65:40). Heidegger argues that DEATH is for DASEIN an abyss (GA20:402–03), because it is our capacity for death that defines us, but it defines us by refusing to allow us to be determined in terms of any occurrent properties or features or relationships we might happen to possess (see also GA65:285). We Dasein, as transcendent beings, are an abyss – that is, as always transcending our factical characteristics, we can never make ourselves fully intelligible even to ourselves:

> in TRANSCENDENCE Dasein surpasses itself as a being; more exactly, this surpassing makes it possible that Dasein can be something like itself. In first surpassing itself, the abyss is opened which Dasein, in each case, is for itself (GA26:233–34).

The "distinguishing mark of the Dasein" is the fact that we can descend into the abyss "unprotected and unsupported" (GA65:487) – in other words, that we can determine ourselves on the basis of a free, creative relationship to the nothing (GA9:312/237–38).

The CLEARING is the abyss of grounds – it allows entities and events to show up as having reasons, by withdrawing itself from notice, let alone understanding (see GA65:352).

The wrestling and mutually determining interaction of the FOURFOLD of EARTH, sky, mortals, and divinities is an abyss – there is no determinate and necessary reason for the configuration that they settle into in any given instance (GA65:486).

Heidegger distinguishes an abyss from an unground. An abyss provides a kind of grounds precisely by withdrawing or holding back any determining reason for the way things are. An unground presents the appearance of a determining reason, but in fact it is an illusion (see GA40:5/3).

Mark A. Wrathall

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA3:167–8, 215; GA5:269–71/200–02, 275/205, 372/281; GA9:165/127, 174–75/134–35, 312/237–38; GA15:298–99/FS 18; GA16:192; GA20:402; GA21:378; GA26:234; GA27:50; GA28:310–11; GA29/30:6, 115, 220, 384, 409, 411; GA38:19/177; GA39:24, 52–53, 105–07, 222, 243; GA40:5/3, 118/116, 121/120; GA42:235; GA43:287; GA45:193; GA51:61–63, 68, 74; GA60:23; GA65:13, 26, 29, 31, 40, 76–77, 139, 236, 280, 285, 307–08, 317, 325, 331, 346, 350, 352, 369–70, 379–88, 438–39, 460, 470–72, 482, 485–90; GA66:11, 22–24, 37, 46, 52, 54, 63, 83–102, 112–13, 116, 125, 131–32, 219–20, 236, 241–42, 295, 307–12, 395; GA67:20–21, 62, 65, 80; GA68:3, 45–48, 98; GA69:98, 213; GA70:10–11, 13, 15, 53, 59, 71, 100, 172, 178; GA75:31–32, 75–76, 122–23, 153; GA79:112–14, 128, 153–54, 159, 175; SZ 152

ACCOMPLISHMENT (*VOLLZUG*). SEE ACTUALIZATION.

ACCUSTOM (*WOHNEN*). SEE DWELLING.

ACT OF INTUITION (*ANSCHAUUNG*). SEE INTUITION.

ACT OF UNDERSTANDING (*VERSTEHEN*). SEE UNDERSTANDING.

ACTUALLY (*FAKTISCH*). SEE FACTICITY.

4.
ACTUALITY (*WIRKLICHKEIT*)

Actuality is a state or condition of being real, effectual, or actuated (i.e., "at work"). Unlike Dasein and the occurrent (*Vorhandene*) in Heidegger's early period, or the fourfold (*Geviert*) and thing (*Ding*) in the later works, actuality (*Wirklichkeit*) does not typically behave like a technical term in Heidegger's oeuvre; nor does it name one of Heidegger's own abiding topics, except in contexts where Heidegger is creatively appropriating the thought of his predecessors. The term occurs frequently in the corpus (to judge by the *Heidegger Concordance*, more often than most others), but many uses are *casual* and not strictly philosophical. The most abundant occurrences are to be found in courses of lectures and seminars dealing with Aristotle, on the one hand (where *Wirklichkeit* often translates the Greek *energeia*), and German Idealism, on the other, with Hegel's well-known claim about the rationality of the actual, and Schelling's anxieties about the actuality of evil, more or less clearly in view, and with the metaphysics of the will, as the last stage in the metaphysics of subjectivity, as Heidegger's principal concern, and the problem of nihilism as the driving force.[1]

Other occurrences, early and late, are tied to a discussion of the modal categories, although Heidegger tends to dismiss the philosophical value of this logical, or formal, way of dealing with the nature and concept of the actual and its actuality, for reasons tied to a long-standing conviction that our *logoi* ought to embody our best efforts to say what entities themselves are, in opposition to the technical orientation of modern and contemporary thought, and the related temptation to construct methods or techniques of thinking divorced from concrete engagement with subject-matter.[2] In *SZ*, actuality is said, famously, to be inferior to possibility, at least as far as extant phenomenology is concerned (SZ 38).

In the earliest lecture courses, and occasionally beyond, Heidegger employs the term, loosely, as a synonym for "reality" (*Realität*), in which case it means to capture the being of something occurrent (or extant), stripped of its significance (the being of an object), or to convey, broadly but more significantly, the effectiveness of an event or an approach to an important historical happening (more on this below). The more interesting uses of "actuality" come during the period of Heidegger's efforts to think through the meaning of work and production (*Arbeit*, *Werk*, *poiêsis*), with Aristotle, and the Greeks more generally, chiefly in view, and in a way tethered eventually to Heidegger's deep and long-standing engagement with art, and poetry in particular, as an original way of disclosing, against what he takes to be the reductive tendencies in the modern era. (Think of "kinetic energy" in modern physics.) And it is this use of the term that deserves close and careful attention.

---

[1] See, for instance, the seminar on Schelling and Hegel published as GA86 and the volume *Zu Ernst Jünger* (GA90).

[2] For one of the most scathing attacks on formal logic, see GA21:12–19. Heidegger's references to actuality as a modal category are too numerous to reference here. For a representative discussion, see *SZ* 143–44.

We should, however, be careful not to identify *energeia* with *actuality*, although the two terms are closely associated in Heidegger's work throughout the middle period. In the earliest extant course devoted expansively to Aristotle (SS 1922), Heidegger renders *energeia* as *reine Zeitigung* (which we might, in light of the context, translate as "pure bringing-to-fruition" or "pure maturation" or, in keeping with the temporal interests burgeoning throughout the early period, as "pure temporal unfolding").[3] This way of carrying the Greek over into contemporary German is surely consistent, semantically, with Heidegger's subsequent translation choices, but it carries connotations that are easy to miss in the language of "actuality."

Energeia as actuality plays an important role in SS 1924 (GA18), where Heidegger associates both the Greek and the German with "the being-at-work" of something and, more specifically, with the being of *praxis* as one of two essential modes of being for Dasein (the other, of course, is theory, which Heidegger at times insists is itself a mode of practice, the highest sort, in fact, in keeping with his eccentric reading of Aristotle).[4] (The course is notable, at the very least, for tying philosophical concepts to the soil of practical life: Heidegger moves toward an account of "actuality" on the basis of a provocative reading of Aristotle's ethics, politics, and rhetoric, each of which has a decidedly pragmatic bent.) But here, too, Heidegger detaches himself from the term, suggesting, in a move echoed in SZ, that the language of actuality has lost its color and naming force, insofar as it has come to suggest the mere being of something extant, or the (causal) effectiveness of something equally extant. Heidegger tends throughout the early period to leave *energeia* untranslated, or to offer a more expansive definitional translation, such as "being-at-work." But both terms (*energeia* and *Wirklichkeit*) are clearly implicated in Heidegger's emerging critique of the metaphysics of production, which he traces back to the early Greek accomplishment, in an admittedly ambivalent account of work and the world of work that finds its way into SZ itself.[5]

In SZ the actual is frequently associated with a conception of BEING or REALITY that is fallen or tranquilized (cf. the remark on death in §53, for instance); otherwise reflection upon "actuality" plays no important role in the argument of Heidegger's early magnum opus.

The texts from Heidegger's middle period dealing focally with actuality privilege accounts of movement that stress the *meaning* of kinetic phenomena, on the one hand, and that stand in opposition to the subjective orientation of modern philosophy, on the other. SS 1931 (GA33) is a central document that includes both moves.[6] Although the course deals with Aristotle – and so complicates any straightforward attribution of the views it presents to Heidegger himself – it is fairly clear that Heidegger's sympathies lie with the ancient philosopher's account of *energeia*,

---

[3] GA62:104. SS 1922 provides the first sustained interpretation of Aristotle, and focuses chiefly on the "genesis of the theoretical" according to *Metaphysics* Alpha, 1–2; but it also thematizes the problem of movement in Aristotle's *Physics* and the "theological" underpinnings of Aristotle's account of θεωρία.

[4] In the opening paragraph of Chapter 2, Heidegger remarks that "actuality" is possibly "the *most fundamental character of being* in Aristotle's doctrine of being" (GA18:43). The conception of work and being-at-work (*In-Arbeit-Sein*) comes forward toward the end of the course (§26, GA18:313). For the complaint about *Wirklichkeit* as a "worn out" term that, were it not so colorless, would be "an excellent translation," see GA18:70.

[5] Zimmerman 1990 remains the best account, in English, of Heidegger's critique of the metaphysics of production.

[6] An earlier, and much briefer, version of the story is presented in SS 1928, in connection with Leibniz's indebtedness to Aristotle (see, e.g., GA26:99). In this context, Heidegger compellingly associates the modern theory of actuality with the concept of the *will* (GA26:56). This connection plays out again and again in Heidegger's subsequent engagements with German Idealism (GA42 and 86 stand out). And it makes an appearance, unsurprisingly, in the Nietzsche lectures as well, where POWER (*Macht*) is said to be the very "actuality of the will" (GA6.1:60 /N1 63).

which is now consistently rendered as *Wirklichkeit* or, in keeping with the Greek root of Aristotle's term of art in *ergon*, the being-at-work of something, insofar as it displays force (*Kraft*), which Heidegger consistently associates with the (meaningful) ability to accomplish something, or to be complicit in the "actualization" of something (worthwhile) – a tool, a skill, a domicile, a human capacity (to understand, for instance, or to be conversant with something). Heidegger is at pains to distinguish between actuality as the being-at-work of force with an end in view (how this lines up with the being-at-work of non-human entities remains an open, and an interesting, question[7]) and the modern conception of the effectuality of something that merely brings about effects in a colorless causal sense: to be at work, or actual, is not to be mechanically involved in a normatively neutral process, but to be ordered and directed toward a *telos*, a "being-accomplished," and so oriented toward success and failure and an idea of the *good*. Actuality in this sense is the way *meaningful* force is present.[8] (Here the causal meaning, captured in expressions such as "actual works of the spirit" and "the actuality of the historical" (GA26:88), bleeds into the philosophical import of the term.) To be effective in *this* sense is to be on the way toward being and faring *well*. (Similar thoughts on the nature of causality in modern thought as an impoverished recasting of ancient conceptions of *aitia* come forward in "The Question Concerning Technology.")

Actuality, unlike reality and causality in the modern sense, is a decidedly normative term, extended to the cosmos in its entirety. (This keeps well with Heidegger's insistence in other contexts that the very idea of being as such is tied, or has been tethered since antiquity, to an idea of the good.) If Heidegger can be said to object to the Aristotelian account, it has more to do with the sense of finality that he finds, perhaps rightly, embedded in Aristotle's theory, and, more importantly in the long run, for modeling being as such on being-produced. As Heidegger notes, "the Greek concept of knowledge [and so, too, the concept of being as such] is essentially determined . . . in terms of the human being's basic relation to work, to that which is fulfilled and fully at an end" (GA33:131). In keeping with the analysis of the work WORLD in SZ, as a phenomenologically viable entry into the being of the world as such, Heidegger avers: "Where there is world, there is work and vice versa" (GA33:146). But here, in 1931 (and looking ahead to the 1935 essay on ART), the work in question is oriented toward the meaning of the product, which is to say: its *world-disclosing* power in the life of a historical community. To be effective or actual, then, is (in the highest sense) to have an impact upon the norm-governed life of a PEOPLE. Many things are real that are not truly actual. The actual is what actuates, what makes for decisiveness or resolve in the lives of individuals and peoples.

Although Heidegger doesn't shy away from the language of freedom, it is clear that what counts as actual is not altogether up to us, save insofar as we are charged with the task of appropriating the works that have come antecedently to matter. Seen in this light, the very idea of actuality is tied to what we might call an ontological conception of history, and being itself, insofar as it sends itself in historical epochs, as the unchosen ground of inhabiting a world.

James D. Reid

---

[7] Heidegger consistently denies that Aristotle offers a "teleological" view of nature (cf. e.g., GA18:83).

[8] It is worth noting that Heidegger associates actuality with a distinctive mode of occurrentness (*Vorhandenheit*), suggesting that the account of occurrentness in SZ is one-sided. There are ways of being present that do not reduce to being merely extant, on hand in an indifferent sort of way.

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 38; GA18:43; GA20:5–10; GA24:48–51, 61–68, 100–06, 121–26, 128–34, 137–39, 142–47, 157–60, 164–66; GA26:56, 88; GA31:66–73, 109–11, 270–74, 289–95; GA33:146; GA36/37:161–64, 209–13; GA42:170–74, 253–56, 181–83; GA48:143–46, 312–15; GA62:38, 94, 277, 355, 399

5.
ACTUALIZATION (*VOLLZUG*)

An ACTUALIZATION IS A comportment in which a relationship to the world is fulfilled. Heidegger's early Freiburg lectures attempt to develop a totally new concept of philosophy. He repeatedly poses the same question: how is it possible to genuinely grasp the phenomenon of life without theoretically distorting it? The phenomenon of immediate life belongs to a totally different sphere, namely the original sphere of the pre-theoretical. As Heidegger insists in his first lecture course, *The Idea of Philosophy and the Problem of Worldview* (1919), real philosophy – that is, philosophy in a primordial sense – emerges from life-world. Life-world is the primary source of our experiences. LIFE and WORLD are two correlative and interdependent realities. Life is directly connected to its environmental world and the horizon of other individuals. Heidegger emphasizes that we should not philosophize on life, but from life itself. We cannot establish a life system; rather, we have to think of life and its HISTORY as the sea in which our existence is already immersed. We cannot escape from life and view it from the outside. As he puts it in the lecture course *Basic Problems of Phenomenology* (1919/20), "life speaks to itself in its own language" (GA58:231).

Heidegger's early philosophical program of grasping the primordial reality of human life implies two fundamental decisions. On the one hand, a *thematic* decision that results in a phenomenological analysis of the fundamental behavior of human life. On the other hand, an eminently *methodological* decision: If the basic philosophical task consists of raising the question of how to immediately access and adequately articulate the primary sphere of life, it is necessary to develop a method capable of disclosing the sense of life and its experiences.

In this context, "actualization" or "fulfillment" (*Vollzug*) is one of the fundamental terms that the young Heidegger coins in his lecture course *Phenomenological Interpretations of Aristotle: Initiation into Phenomenological Research* (1921/22, GA61) with the methodological intention of indicating and grasping the intrinsic movement of life. Actualization, as explained in the aforementioned lecture course, is one of the three formal indications that phenomenological analysis has to take into consideration when describing a phenomenon like life. The three aspects that come into play are:

> What experiencing a phenomenon consists of – its content (*Gehalt*).
> The way one refers to a phenomenon – its relation (*Bezug*).
> And how this relation is fulfilled – its actualization (*Vollzug*).

The use and the meaning of actualization can only be properly understood by keeping in mind Husserl's correlation principle of *noesis-noema*. Heidegger uses Husserl's notion of INTENTIONALITY to explain the interrelationship of life and world. But – as Heidegger points out on different occasions – Husserl understands intentionality in a thematic and objective way and therefore reduces CONSCIOUSNESS to its pure cognitive dimension. This prevents a direct understanding of the practical and dynamic relationship that exists between factical life and world. Consciousness is always consciousness *of* something. Consciousness, so to speak, exists out of itself, it points to something other than itself. For example, the chair I am sitting on right

now while typing on my computer is not *in* my consciousness, not even as a representation. The chair is in my office, next to the window, in front of my desk, on the floor.

The first step of philosophy – conceived by Heidegger as the primordial science of life – consists of expelling things from consciousness and restoring the primary relationship between things and world. "Our life is our world – and rarely [is it] such that we [simply] sit back and watch it; but rather we are always – even if quite discreetly, [while] hidden – taking part [in it], enthralled, repelled, enjoying [it], renouncing [it].... And our life is only life, insofar as it lives in a world" (GA58:33ff.). There is nothing beyond or behind phenomena. We have to get over the classical dualism of subject and object, realism and idealism, and start analyzing life and its experiences in its immediate givenness. In order to avoid any kind of subjectivism, Heidegger starts using the term "comportment" (*Verhalten*) instead of "LIVED EXPERIENCE" (*Erlebnis*). Thus, actualization (*Vollzug*) is a life's way of behaving, which formally indicates how (*wie*) the acts of life are fulfilled.

The young Heidegger is eager to emphasize the practical, dynamic, enactive, and hence a-theoretical and pre-reflective aspects of human life. It embraces both our mental states, conscious and unconscious, and the expressive and creative acts that constitute our life. All these active aspects will be later integrated in the concept of CARE (*Sorge*). One can trace back this dynamic and active character of life in the Grimms' *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. As is known, Heidegger often used this dictionary when he was preparing his lectures and writings (Adrián Escudero 2009, 185–86). It is most likely that he had Grimms' definition of *vollziehen* in mind, as he did in 1919 with the captivating verbal expression "to world" (*welten*). In short, actualization (*Vollzug*) brings together a variety of comportments that in one way or another entail a reference to the notions of activity, process, mobility, enactment, and fulfillment that Heidegger tried to transmit in his early lectures.

Furthermore, in his lecture course of 1919/20 he makes a clear distinction between relational sense (*Bezugssinn*), content sense (*Gehaltsinn*), and actualization sense (*Vollzugssinn*). Those three senses express the directions that our life takes in its relationship with the world.[1]

Relational sense. The core idea throughout Heidegger's early lectures in Freiburg is that life and world are originally intertwined. To put it differently, human life is something essentially open, dynamic, unfinished, creative, moved by habits, motives and tendencies – not always conscious but tacitly operative when establishing intentional bridges between life and world. We always live in an environment, a circle of tasks, and life conditions, where we are with others. Thus, life is not something closed like a shell. The relational sense of life in which we always live refers to the fact that life is not encapsulated in itself but rather open to things, situations, and other persons, and even itself. In particular, the relational sense includes the diverse modes in which life relates to the world in the triple modality of surrounding world (*Umwelt*), shared-world (*Mitwelt*), and self-world (*Selbstwelt*). The basic relational modes enumerated by Heidegger are tendency (*Neigung*), distance (*Abstand*), and occlusion (*Abriegelung*) (GA61:100–06). Finally, the relational sense – characteristic of the care that life shows for the world – refers to the intrinsic movement of life, which the young Heidegger formally determines as relucence (*Reluzenz*), prestructure (*Praestruktion*), and ruinance (*Ruinanz*) (GA61:117–32).

---

[1] The strict division of relational, content, and actualization senses disappears after the lecture course of 1921/22, but the formal indications are still operative in *Being and Time*.

Content sense. As Heidegger shows in *Basic Problems of Phenomenology* (1919/20), our life has motives and tendencies. Every motive and tendency has certain content. This content is a life-world. Thus, the content sense fundamentally refers to the world experienced by life in its constitutive relation with it.

Actualization sense. Among the three senses, actualization sense (*Vollzugssinn*) is the most important one, since it spontaneously emerges from the self and determines the way one lives one's life. In the lecture course of 1921/22, actualization sense formally indicates how factical life fulfills itself in the inauthentic form of ruinance (*Ruinanz*), which is a formal indication of its fallenness (GA61:131–32, 140–56). In its actualization, ruinance tends to make things easy to such an extent we no longer have time to care about our own life.

Finally, in the lecture course *Phenomenological Investigations on Aristotle* (1921/22), relational sense, content sense, and actualization sense constitute the triple schematization of intentionality. All three senses are unified in the temporalizing sense (*Zeitigungssinn*) (GA61:53). These different senses are formal indications phenomenological analysis uses to explicitly articulate the fundamental movement of factical life and its ways of comportment. The temporalizing sense allows Heidegger to distinguish between the authentic and inauthentic comportment that life adopts when facing different situations in the course of its existence. Life is not a static thing, with defined contours, but rather in constant movement, an activity that temporalizes from itself.

Jesús Adrián Escudero

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA59:63, 70, 74–86, 146–48, 151–52, 173–74; GA60:64, 83, 90, 108–09, 111–15, 121–23, 137, 204, 240, 249, 262–72, 323; GA61:52–60, 125–30, 137–39, 140–55

FURTHER READING

Adrián Escudero 2015, Dahlstrom 1994, Ihmdahl 1997, Kisiel 1996, Rodríguez 1997

6.
ADAPTATION (*EREIGNIS*)

ADAPTATION IS THE "simplest and gentlest of all laws" (GA12:248/OWL 128), which governs how entities become manifest as what they are – namely, it ordains that something's ESSENCE is disclosed in terms of that to which it is adapted or well-suited. The German word "*Ereignis*," translated here as "adaptation," is built on the root verb *eignen sich* – to be apt or suitable for something (see section 3 below). That to which things are adapted need not itself be an entity – indeed, the principal cases of interest to Heidegger are DASEIN's adaptation to BEING, the NOTHING, to DEATH and the WORLD (none of which, of course, are entities). Another paradigmatic case of adaptation is the way EARTH and world emerge and are constituted through their adaptive strife with each other (GA66:98). Mortals are constituted through their adaptation to the gods, the earth, and the sky, and conversely the gods, earth, and sky get their particular character out of an adaptation to mortals and each other (see GA66:235; GA65:310–11; FOURFOLD).

In a late retrospective note, Heidegger describes adaptation as "the motto of my thinking since 1936" (GA9:315 n. a/241 n. b). It would be difficult to disagree with this self-assessment. Adaptation plays a vital explanatory role in his accounts of the HISTORY OF BEING, the task of philosophy, the nature of the CLEARING, the work of ART, and LANGUAGE. The word is liberally scrawled in the margins of Heidegger's own copies of his published works to remind himself that "this must be thought in terms of adaptation," or "on the basis of adaptation," or as "having an adaptation-like quality" (*Ereignishaft*). And adaptation is the central theme of several lengthy manuscripts, now appearing in Heidegger's collected works (see, e.g., GA65, 66, 67, 69, 70, and the eponymous GA71).

1 ADAPTATION AND RELATIONAL ONTOLOGY

As the *Beiträge* announces, "the saying of adaptation" is "the first answer to the question of being" (GA65:6). Heidegger conceives of the "question of being" as involving two parts. On the one hand, when asking about BEING, we are asking for an account of the SENSE or meaning of being and, since Heidegger argues that being has a history, we are also asking about the different styles of being up until the present – the history of what Heidegger calls the "first INCEPTION" (*erster Anfang*). Putting being into question involves asking questions like: how is being understood at any given time? How does it get "decided" what *is* in any given world? How is being revealed to us? What is its history? On the other hand, the question of being also has a performative or transformative aspect – in asking it, Heidegger believes, we try to realize our potential as those beings who are capable of understanding and interpreting being and of taking a stand on our own EXISTENCE. Thus, there is a way of asking the question of being that aims at a transformation of who we are, in the process inaugurating a new history and a fundamentally different relationship to the world around us: "questioning concerning the TRUTH of BEYNG can not be calculated from what is past. And if it is to prepare the inception of

another history, the carrying out [of the questioning] must be original" (GA65:10; see also the twofold articulation of the task at the end of §52, GA65:112). On the performative side, then, asking the question of being means putting ourselves into question with respect to who we are, thereby provoking a self-transformation.

Heidegger's decades-long effort to "say 'adaptation'" (see, e.g., GA65:6 and GA14:30) accordingly plays two distinct roles corresponding to the two different kinds of question Heidegger asks. First, it helps us to understand how it is that, since "the first inception," there has been a series of epochs of being, of different worlds. Second, by getting "adapted to adaptation" we become capable of inhabiting the world in a new way. On Heidegger's account, there is a sense in which adaptation has been operative in generating Western thought and history, without anyone knowing it or experiencing it as such. Thus, there is a possibility of our having a new and different history, provided that we can transform ourselves and prepare ourselves for an experience of ontological adaptation. "What we call 'ad-aptation' in the most rigorous sense of the word," Heidegger explains, "allows human beings and being to belong together." He elaborates: "we will only be allowed to appropriately inquire and conjecture into who we humans genuinely are and what being genuinely is, when thinking has entered into that realm where aptness (*Eignung*), appropriation (*Vereignung*), property (*Eigentum*), and authenticity (*Eigentlichkeit*) prevail – namely, into ad-aptation" (GA79:126).

Throughout his career, Heidegger was convinced that being could not be accounted for in either causal or logical terms. Instead, he developed a relationalist ontology, according to which what something is, is (at least in large part) a function of the manifold relations it bears to other things. Each particular "CLEARING" gives priority to some types of relationship and allows other kinds of relationship to withdraw into irrelevance or insignificance. What things *are* in the most basic, ontological sense, then, is a function of the "open space of the clearing" within which they manifest themselves. The law of adaptation (*Ereignis*) holds that the determinative relations – the relations that define the essence of something – are relationships of mutual adaptation. What an entity *is*, in other words, is a function of that for which it is apt (*eignet*) or suitable (*geeignet*), so that everything becomes what it is through entering into a kind of "dance" (*Reigen*) in which it gets into sync with others (see GA7:181ff./PLT 178ff. on the "dance of adaptating," *der Reigen des Ereignens*). The open space of salient relations "is never the effect of a cause nor the consequence of a reason" (GA12:247/OWL 127). It is, instead, "produced" or "brought forth" by adaptation (see GA12:246–47/OWL 126–27). Thus Heidegger's thesis also involves the thought that the underlying tendency toward adaptation governs the world: "adaptation" names "the gentleness of the highest rule, which does not require POWER or the 'struggle,' but rather requires the most original setting of one thing against another" (GA69:9). It is "the force-less prevailing" (GA69:9).

Adaptation thus can have the sense of both a condition of suitedness or aptness or fittingness, and a process that leads toward that condition of aptness. In the latter sense, Heidegger argues that adaptation is the prevailing tendency that governs the history of being. World-historical epochs change through a process of disrupting, reorienting, and then consolidating the constitutive relational networks that allow entities to be what they are. This process of world disclosure can only succeed if the initial leap into a new sensibility can draw human practices to it in such a way that they can become fitted and suited to the emerging network of constituent relations: "the transformation of entities and therewith the grounding of the truth of adaptation

gains constancy" when it is received by community, the members of which are "interrelated in accordance with their common historical (earthly-worldly) origin" (GA65:96).

"Adaptation" also serves as Heidegger's title for a singularity he anticipates in the history of being, through which the current technological understanding of being (and, indeed, the entire age of METAPHYSICS) will be overcome, and in which we humans will be adapted in our essence to BEYNG (see, e.g., GA66:293; GA46:221; GA65:26; GA69:110; GA70:48; and GA69:213 – "in the first inception, beyng essences as EMERGENCE [*phusis*]; in the other inception, beyng essences as adaptation"). Adaptation in this special historical sense, in other words, names a new or other beginning, the INCEPTION of an age when the gentle law of adaptation is allowed to most fully come into its own and be experienced as such. Heidegger explains, "it is necessary to experience plainly this being suited, within which human beings and being are adapted to each other," and that experience, Heidegger explained, is what it means to "enter into that which we call 'adaptation'" (GA11:45/HR 291).

Heidegger argues that the current technological age is one in which the being of entities is that about them which allows them to serve as resources, on call and available for use in the maximum number of ways with minimal constraints on their exploitation. His title for the way entities are arranged in the technological age is the INVENTORY or SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT-(ION)ING (*Ge-Stell*).[1] The essence of technology is the inventory (see GA11:116/QCT 38) in the sense that everything in the technological world is experienced as transformable into a stock of goods that are arranged in an inventory and readily available for use. The advent of the age of adaptation will overcome our experience of entities as actual or potential resources, set in place in an inventory:

> in ad-aptation is encountered the possibility that it (i.e., adaptation) overcomes the sheer rule of the in-ventory (*Ge-Stell*), turning it into a more original adapting. Such an overcoming of the in-ventory by virtue of ad-aptation would bring the adaptive withdrawal (that is, a withdrawal that is never to be produced by human beings alone) of the technological world from its domination back to servitude, through which the human being reaches more authentically into ad-aptation. (GA11:46/ HR 292)

Properly understood, the technological understanding of being is a "pre-form of adaptation itself," a "way station" between "the epochal shapes of being and the transformation of being into adaptation" (GA14:62–63). Metaphysical understandings of being will only be overcome through "the ad-apting of the human being into the truth of beyng, which adapting necessitates a transformation of a unique kind" (GA66:387; see also GA69:123; GA68:167).

In the post-metaphysical age that Heidegger anticipates, the process of adaptation will no longer be forced into line with the overarching technological organization of things. Instead, it will be possible to have a local and particular "adapting mirror-play of the simple onefold of earth and sky, mortals and divinities" (GA7:181/PLT 177), an "adapting mirror-play" in which they come "to be tied to each other in simple unity" (GA7:181/PLT 178). "DWELLING" is Heidegger's name for human practices that are adapted to the local and particular world of the

---

[1] In colloquial German, a *Gestell* is a rack or set of shelves. Heidegger interpreters often translate it loosely as "enframing" or "the framework." But the colloquial meaning is nearer the mark: Heidegger's point is that all entities in the age of *Ge-Stell* are reduced to resources or STANDING RESERVES and placed on call, as if in a gigantic inventory.

mutually adapted fourfold: "in saving the earth, in receiving the sky, in awaiting the divinities, in initiating mortals, dwelling adapts itself as the four-dimensional preservation of the fourfold" (GA7:153/PLT 149).

2   THE DIFFERENT SENSES OF *EREIGNIS*

In colloquial German, *Ereignis* (the word translated here as "adaptation") means an event, an incident, a happening. As is often the case with words that he put to philosophical work, Heidegger insists that *Ereignis* could not be understood in terms of its ordinary, common meaning. He observes in general that, "the truth of beyng does not allow itself to be said with ordinary language, which today is being misused and used up" (GA65:78). And he repeatedly emphasizes that the commonplace meaning of *Ereignis* as an event or an occurrence is misleading when it comes to thinking about *Ereignis* in Heidegger's philosophical sense: "we can no longer take as our guide the common verbal meaning in order to represent what is named with the name '*das Ereignis*'" (GA14:22). At the same time, Heidegger is equally insistent that '*Ereignis*' was deliberately chosen because of its roots in natural language. Heidegger does not think "a new language could be invented for [expressing] beyng" (GA65:78), but rather argues that, to make progress in understanding being, we need to awaken the essential force (*Wesensgewalt*) of natural languages. "The word '*Ereignis*,'" Heidegger explains, "is taken from language as it has naturally developed" (GA11:45/HR 291). For this reason, he continues, "the word '*Ereignis*' can be translated just as little as the Greek key word *Logos* and the Chinese *Tao*" (GA11:45/HR 292). The point is, I take it, that having developed naturally in its home language, *Ereignis* will have laid down etymological roots and semantic connections too rich and varied to be captured by any single term in a language other than German. And this point is well taken; as we will see, the noun "*Ereignis*" is implicated in a very intricate semantic web. If the word is to be translated at all – and it surely should be translated in order to facilitate the understanding of Heidegger's work – then we will have to decide which of these meanings takes the lead in Heidegger's use of the term. Let's review some of the possible candidates.

§2.1   *Ereignis* as Event

As already noted, the most common colloquial meaning of the German noun *Ereignis* is simply an 'event' or an 'occurrence,' and the reflexive verb *sich ereignen*, from which *Ereignis* is derived, means in common parlance "to happen" or "to occur." Many interpreters and translators of Heidegger thus have taken *Ereignis* to mean an event, albeit a distinctive kind of event. They accordingly translate *Ereignis* as "the primal event," or "the event," or "the occurrence," or "the coming-to-pass." There are contexts in which such translations seem to work well,[2] and the reflexive verb *sich ereignen* is almost always best translated as "to happen" or "to occur." But as I will argue below, the occurrence or happening of primary interest to Heidegger (particularly in his later work) is the process through which things tend toward a condition of mutual fittingness. This process *could* be thought of as something like an event, but only if one is clear about the senses in which it is *unlike* an ordinary event or occurrence.

---

[2] Heidegger does not always use *Ereignis* and *sich ereignen* as terms of art – sometimes he uses them merely in the ordinary, colloquial sense. See, e.g., GA52:36, where "the northeasterly is blowing" names an "*Ereignis*," a happening.

In addition, the historical singularity discussed above is also described as a kind of happening. For example, Heidegger writes that

> only the greatest happening [*Geschehen*], the deepest most intimate *Ereignis*, can still save us from being lost in the bustle of mere events [*Begebenheiten*] and machinations. What must happen [*sich ereignen*] is an opening up to us of being. (GA65:57)

And yet, the idea that *Ereignis* is an event or a happening is one that Heidegger also explicitly renounces: "the word '*Ereignis*' here does not mean anymore what we normally call some sort of happening [*Geschehnis*], an occurrence [*Vorkommnis*]" (GA11:45/HR 292). In his marginal notes to his own copy of "Der Satz der Identität," Heidegger added that *Ereignis* is also not a "*Begebenheit*," another expression for "event." This insistence that *Ereignis* should not be understood as an event is repeated over and over again. For instance, in the earliest extended meditation on *Ereignis* – the *Beiträge zur Philosophie* (*Vom Ereignis*) – Heidegger notes that, "in the end, *Ereignis* cannot be re-presented as an 'event' or 'something new'" (GA65:256). And at the other end of his career, in his very late essay "Time and Being" – one of the clearest treatises addressing the meaning of *Ereignis* that Heidegger published in his own lifetime – Heidegger insists that

> that which is named with the name "*das Ereignis*" can no longer be represented on the guidelines of the current meaning of the word; for the current meaning of the word understands "*Ereignis*" in the sense of an occurrence [*Vorkommnis*] or a happening [*Geschehnis*]. (GA14:25–26)

The insistence that "*Ereignis* . . . cannot be represented either as an occurrence [*Vorkommnis*] or a happening [*Geschehnis*]" (GA12:247/OWL 127) is repeated too frequently to be disregarded or ignored.

This paradox – that *Ereignis* involves an alteration, but that it is in no sense representable as an event or occurrence or happening of any kind – forces us to think more carefully about the kind of process implied by adaptation. One thing is perfectly clear: adaptation is not an ontic event of the sort that concerned Kant – a change in the condition of a substance, which is the causal consequence of prior conditions (see, e.g., *Critique of Pure Reason*, A191/B237 and A194/B239). Rather, adaptation in Heidegger's sense is something that "goes on underneath the events [*Begebenheiten*] of the still-prevailing [historical] age" (GA16:281).

One might argue that *Ereignis*, at least when it names a historical singularity, must be an event because it involves a change (an "inception"). There is something to be said for this view. But what changes is not an ontic situation, state, or condition (the sort of changes that we ordinarily describe as "events"). Heidegger offers in the *Beiträge* an illuminating list of paradigmatic instances of an *Ereignis*:

> the assignment of truth to beyng, the collapse of truth, the consolidation of the non-essence (*Unwesen*) of truth (correctness), the abandonment of entities by being, the return of beyng in its truth, the kindling of the hearth fire (the truth of beyng) as the lonely site of the passing-by of the last God, the flaring up of the singular uniqueness of beyng. (GA65:227–28)

What all these examples have in common is that they involve a global change to the meaning or truth of entities. They are "decisions about the essence of truth":

The way in which entities as a whole are manifest, and the way in which human beings are allowed to stand within this manifestation, is grounded and transformed in such a decision. Such an *Ereignis* is rare, and the rare history, when it occurs [*ereignet sich*] and is prepared, is so simple that the human being at first and for a long time overlooks and misjudges it, because his view is disturbed by the habituation to the great diversity of the ordinary. (GA51:21)

A historical *Ereignis* thus alters the space of possibilities for events, but it is not itself an event.[3] It is not a causal process, and it doesn't change the objective features or conditions of entities: "*Ereignis* effectuates nothing" (GA70:76).

A significant problem with translating *Ereignis* as "event," then, is that this translation invites the misapprehension that it is some species of ordinary causal change, or some transformation in the properties of entities. "*Er-eignis*," Heidegger explains, "is essentially richer than any conceivable plenitude of events [*Begebenheit*]" (GA70:17). Indeed, he elaborates, "the very question 'what happens in *Ereignis* itself?' falls short of the essence of *Ereignis*" (GA70:17). That is, to try to imagine *Ereignis* as if it is an event or consists of events is to miss the point. Such happenings "remain infinitely distinct from the *Er-eignis* itself" (GA70:17). *Ereignis* itself is not an ontic occurrence, a change in material conditions, or some causal affair running its course; it is instead an ontological process "in which first and alone any entity whatsoever can arise into its being out of itself" (GA70:17–18).

But this points to a second problem with translating *Ereignis* as "event." This translation tells us nothing about the type of process involved in *Ereignis*. For that, we need to look to other candidates for a translation of the term.

§2.2 *Ereignis* as Coming into View

A very important strand of signification for Heidegger's account of *Ereignis* is found in its relationship to words having to do with vision or manifestation. As Heidegger himself repeatedly pointed out, and as the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* confirms, the root *eignen* in *Ereignis* is a corruption of *eugen* or *äugen*, verbs formed around the root word *ouga* or *Auge*: "eye." As Thomas Sheehan explains, "*er-öugen* and *er-äugen*, as well as the obsolete High German verb *er-eigen*, all . . . mean 'to place before the eyes, to show'" (Sheehan 2015, 231–32). Grimms' dictionary notes that the earliest meaning of *ereigen sich* is "to show oneself," or "to reveal oneself" as such and such a thing, and only in a derivative sense "to happen or occur."[4] Heidegger's occasional reliance on this aspect of the etymology leads Sheehan at one point to propose "coming into view" as a translation for *Ereignis*, and Sheehan equates *Ereignis* with "the opening of the open on the basis of a concealment" (Sheehan 2001, 198). There is something clearly right about emphasizing the connection between *Ereignis* and becoming manifest. "*Ereignis*," Heidegger notes, "is a bringing to sight that makes apt" (GA11:121/QCT 45). In and through *Ereignis*, relationships, meanings, and possibilities come into view that are suited to the situation, thus at times altering the essential structure of the things and situations we encounter.[5]

---

[3] See also: "History is not a sequence of any occurrences [*Vorgängen*] and events [*Begebenheiten*]. History is the settlement of the essence of truth, but this settlement itself has the character of an *Ereignis*, and this is beyng" (GA70:44).

[4] "*Ereigen*," Grimm and Grimm 1862, 784.

[5] Oddly enough, no one has adopted "coming into view" as a translation for *Ereignis*, even though it is nearer to the mark than "event," "enownment," or "appropriation." Even Sheehan lapses back into translating it as "appropriation" (Sheehan 2015, 234).

§2.3   *Ereignis* as Appropriating or "Enowning"

According to the *Deutsches Wörterbuch*, when the word *ereugen/eräugen* was initially corrupted into *ereigen*, "it gave rise to a confusion with the completely unrelated word *eigen* [own], *proprium*, and consequently with … *aneignen* [to take or appropriate something], *zueignen* [to give ownership to another]."[6] If this is right, then *Ereignis* is, in fact, a false cognate of *eigen*, "own," and related words like *Eigentum* (property or ownership), and *Aneignung* (appropriation). And yet, as noted already, Heidegger embraced the term *Ereignis* precisely because of the many different strands of meaning that accrued to it organically within the German language "as it has naturally developed." Thus, the spuriousness of the etymological relation didn't stop Heidegger from connecting *Ereignis* to the notion of the "own." In fact, there are several related but distinct types of "owning" that Heidegger connects to the concept of *Ereignis*: coming into one's own (in the sense of being individualized or manifesting a true nature); "self-ownership" in the sense of AUTHENTICITY (*Eigentlichkeit*; see, e.g., GA66:155); and the conveying or taking ownership (i.e., appropriation) of property. For instance, Heidegger claims that *Ereignis* "determines the human being as the property of beyng" (GA65:263). Of course, ownership in such cases is not a matter of holding a moral or legal right to exclusive use and enjoyment of a thing. Rather, being the property of some other means falling under the dominion or normative claims of that other.

It is in these terms – i.e., in terms of subjecting something to normative constraints – that we should understand Heidegger's oft-repeated claim that *Ereignis* is involved in conveying ownership (*Übereignung*) of one thing to another. Heidegger opens the *Beiträge*, for instance, by explaining that the purpose of the book is to contribute to a situation in which the reader can be "conveyed [*übereignet*] to *Er-eignis*," and such a conveyance "is tantamount to a transformation of the essence of the human being from the 'rational animal' [*animal rationale*] into the Da-sein" (GA65:3). One comes under the dominion of an other when one's essence is transformed appropriately, so as to suit one for that other. It is crucial that, on Heidegger's account, the conveyance of ownership and appropriation that goes on in *Ereignis* is never one-sided. For instance, the mutual adaptation of God and the human being involves a reciprocity of ownership: "*Ereignis* conveys God to the human being by appropriating the human being to God. This conveying appropriation is *Ereignis*" (GA65:26; see also GA65:280). Moreover, conveying one into a new domain will require an "expropriation" (*Enteignis*) – that is, unsuiting one for the old domain in preparation for a transformation. For instance, Heidegger observes of our current sense of being at home in the technological world that a "path on which man could experience entities more inceptually" would only open up if *Ereignis* "first dispossesses (*enteignet*) being and the human being in what is proper to them" so that they are no longer locked into a "reciprocal challenging into the calculation of what is calculable" (GA11:49/HR 293). Once humans and being are dispossessed by the technological mode of revealing, they will be open to being conveyed to and appropriated by another mode.

In conveying things into another domain, and rendering them property of the other and thus fit and proper to inhabit the other's domain, *Ereignis* also brings things "into their own (*ins Eigene*), in such a way that entities first arise to themselves" (GA70:175). Ownness, however, is

---

[6] "*Ereignen*," Grimm & Grimm 1862, vol. III, 785.

never something that entities possess inherently or intrinsically – it emerges only relationally, in the process of being conveyed into a specific domain into which it comes to fit or be well-suited.

Because *Ereignis* is connected in these ways to property, to appropriating and conveying ownership, and to bringing things into their own, many translators opt to translate *Ereignis* in a way that makes the sense of ownership primary – for instance, as "appropriation" or "enowning" or "enownment." Such translations suggest that *Ereignis* is primarily a matter of making something one's own or of something coming into its own. Other translators combine the notions of ownership and event, and opt for a translation like "appropriative event."

§2.4 *Ereignis* as Adaptation

In the course of the organic developments in the German verb *ereignen*, not only did the root word mutate from seeing (*äugen*) to owning (*eigen*), but (according to the Grimms) a second corruption occurred: the letter *n* "mistakenly crept into '*ereigen*'" resulting in the modern spelling and pronunciation: *ereignen* (Grimm and Grimm 1862, 785). When the letter *n* crept in, "it gave rise to a confusion . . . with *eignen*" (*ibid*.). As a result, it was possible for Heidegger to hear the verb *ereignen* and noun *Ereignis* as semantically connected not just to ideas of property, appropriation, and vision, but also to the reflexive verb *eignen sich*, "to be adapted or suited." For Heidegger, this development, far from confusing or obscuring the "true" meaning of the word, is a productive cross-fertilization of significance. Thus, rather than attempting to purify the word *Ereignis* back to its archaic roots, Heidegger celebrates the connection between the notions of making visible or manifest, and the "erroneously" adopted ideas of ownership and of being apt or suitable for something. The *er-* prefix has the grammatical function of making an intransitive root verb into a transitive verb (Kühnhold and Wellmann 1973a, 359). Thus, to *er-eignen* is to make-apt or make-suitable. Heidegger explicitly defines *ereignen* as the transitivizing of *eignen* (GA11:78 n.151), and he frequently hyphenates the noun *Er-eignis* and the verb *er-eignen* to emphasize this. The *er-* prefix also suggests[7] that *Ereignis* involves the intensification or successful completion of this process of making apt or well adapted (*eignen*) – that is, the achievement of a condition of being suitable or apt (*geeignet*) for something.

In form, too, the German word *ereignen* is analogous to the English word "adapt." The prefix "ad-" signifies motion toward, reaching, or intensification of a tendency toward a certain state or condition (see *Oxford English Dictionary*, "ad-, *prefix*"). The root "apt" comes from the Latin verb *aptō*, "to fit on" or "to fit together," "to bring into position for use," "to make ready," or "to form or modify so as to suit, adapt, accommodate, fit."[8] Thus, the translation of *Ereignis* as "adaptation" is a straightforward way to capture this key strand of Heidegger's meaning.

Heidegger reminds himself in his marginal comments to his essay "The Onto-theo-logical Constitution of Metaphysics": "instead of 'essence' (understood verbally) . . . say: being adapted [*Eignen*], the bringing something to itself (letting it come to itself) so that it can appear as itself" (GA11:78 n.151). *Ereignen* as a non-reflexive verb, in other words, names for Heidegger the transitive action of bringing something into its essence by adapting it, making it apt or suitable for a specific purpose or function.

---

[7] Kühnhold and Wellmann 1973a, 148–49. "The main function of the prefix *er-*" is "the successful bringing-to-the-end of the activity of the root verb."

[8] Glare 1982, 155.

3   TRANSLATING *EREIGNIS*

We've seen, then, that Heidegger's use of the word *Ereignis* brings together at least four different strands of meaning – strands that can be excavated from the word as it naturally developed in the German language. *Ereignis*

* involves or makes possible happenings (although it is not itself an event);
* it allows things to be made manifest;
* it includes moments of owning, appropriating, and conveying one thing to another;

and, finally,

* it is a making things apt or suited or adapted to each other.

It would be a false step to try to decide which of these semantic elements is *the* uniquely right one for understanding *Ereignis*. Heidegger's claim that *Ereignis* can't be translated is meant precisely to alert us to the fact that he doesn't want to narrow the meaning down to just one of its valences. If we are going to translate it into English, rather than asking "what's the right meaning?" we ought to ask instead: "which of these meanings does Heidegger want to take the lead? Which is the central meaning that holds the others together?" Any translation into a foreign language inevitably severs the word from all the resonances that exist in the natural language which gave birth to the word. In translating it, then, we need to minimize the damage by selecting the meaning that holds the others together, and from which we can plausibly derive the others. And in doing that, we need to avoid "randomly picking truths out of the word" (GA65:78). Instead, we should select a translation that allows us to most perspicuously understand the philosophical work that is performed by the notion. That requires us to grasp in what sense happening, showing, owning, and adapting are involved in a unified and coherent phenomenon rather than seeing them as an accidental piling up of meanings alongside each other.

Fortunately, Heidegger offered us several clear indications about which meaning takes the lead in his understanding of *Ereignis*. In one of the most important essays dealing with *Ereignis* that Heidegger published in his lifetime, "Der Weg zur Sprache," he insists that "we can only name *Ereignis* if we say: it – *Ereignis* – makes suitable [*es eignet*]" (GA12:247/OWL 128). This is because it is the concept of being apt or well suited that explains and draws the other meanings together. Heidegger thus uses *Ereignis* to name a *condition* of being mutually well adapted or suited for one another. When he wants to emphasize the *process* through which things arrive at a condition of adaptation, he employs the non-reflexive verb *ereignen*. When Heidegger uses the reflexive verb form *sich ereignen*, it is almost always best translated as "to happen" or "to occur," although in his later works, this occurring involves an adaptive process. For instance, Heidegger explains that "poesy[9] happens in language, because language preserves the original essence of poetry" (GA5:62/46–47). The idea is that the happening of poetic verse in language is made possible because language is well adapted to poetry and vice versa.

Adaptation is the conceptual heart of *Ereignis*, because it is being apt or fit for the context within which things occur that allows them to come into view. Before something can show up *as* anything at all, it needs to have settled into a more or less stable relationship of fitting in with the things around it. We've already quoted Heidegger's observation that "being adapted" or

---

[9] Poetry in "the narrower sense" – a linguistic composition in verse.

"suited" is a "bringing something to itself (letting it come to itself) so that it can appear as itself" (GA11:78 n.151). Adaptation is at the heart of coming to see, because we can only see what we have the skills and capacities to discriminate. This requires that we be adapted to the perceptual situation in which we find ourselves.[10]

Adaptation also sustains ownership and self-ownership, and explains in what sense ontological relationships involve conveyance and appropriation. In the ontological register that is Heidegger's principal concern, ownership and property are not defined in the ordinary, familiar terms of rights of exclusive enjoyment and use. Rather, something is the property of another when it is adapted or suited to the possession of the other: "every genuine property," Heidegger notes, "is that to the 'possession' of which we are suited" (GA52:174). So owning and being owned, appropriating (i.e., taking as one's own) and conveyance (giving to the ownership of another), are understood in terms of things being adapted or suited to each other. Moreover, things come into their own on Heidegger's account by becoming adapted or suited for the world in which they appear:

> Being suitable for something [*das Eignen*] ... brings forth that which presences and that which absences into its particular own [*Eigenes*], in terms of which this shows itself in itself, and lingers after its kind. The being suitable that brings forth ... is called the adapting [*Ereignen*]. (GA12:246–47/OWL 127)

Only such an adaptation lets entities achieve a stable ability to endure within the practical contexts of a particular world. On Heidegger's account, nothing comes into its own all on its own. We discover what we are, or what anything else is, only by discovering where we or it are most at home. For example, "that which lets both [time and being] belong to each other, that which doesn't merely bring both matters into their own [*in ihr Eigenes bringt*], but rather preserves them and holds them in their belonging together ... is *Ereignis*" (GA14:20). Adaptation in the fullest sense is thus both transitive and reciprocal. *A* adapts *B*, and in the process, *A* is adapted to *B*. When *B* is adapted to *A*, *A* can be said to "own" *B*. And when *A* is found in a situation to which it is well adapted, *A* has "come into its own."

Thus it is in terms of adaptation that all the other senses of *Ereignis* are understood and united with each other. It is the fact of having been adapted to one another that makes things discernible or recognizable and thus brings them to disclosure. Ontological "events" or occurrences are defined in terms of coming into either an adaptive or maladaptive condition. And things "own" each other in virtue of their being well adapted or suited to each other. Thus, adaptation is conceptually prior to the event of appropriation, to coming into view, and to enownment.

Translating *Ereignis* as adaptation also illuminates Heidegger's oft-repeated linking of *Ereignis* to a number of other words, the connection to which is obscured by the other proposed translations of the term. For instance, Heidegger often discusses *Ereignis* as playing a part in making things fit to or joined to each other (*fügen*; see, e.g., GA65:510, and FITTINGNESS). The reflexive verb *sich fügen* means to fit oneself into something, to accommodate or make oneself

---

[10] For example, Heidegger explains that our ability to discern the gods and be discerned by them involves our becoming adapted to them: "the '*between*' ad-apts [*er-eignet*] the Da-sein to the god, in which ad-apting alone the human beings and the god become 'discernible' to each other" (GA65:86–87).

suitable to or comply with another thing.[11] Heidegger explains, for example, that the "domain of property as the prevailing of being adapted [*Eignung*] is the occurrence of the inherently well-fitted [*gefügten*] appropriation and conveyence" (GA65:320). Heidegger also ties *Ereignis* closely to the reflexive use of *schicken* – *sich schicken* means to be fit, to be proper and, relatedly, to be skillful (*geschickt*) in dealing with a situation because one is adapted and suited to it. *Ereignis*, he explains, cannot be understood as an event or occurrence, but rather should be thought "in terms of being adapted [*Eignen*], as a being sufficient or suitable [*Schicken*] which preserves and clears" (GA14:26). In a kind of pun, Heidegger also links *ereignen* to the completely unrelated verb *reigen*, to align, and the derived noun *der Reigen*, the dance (see, e.g., "Das Ding," GA79:19). As things become adapted to one another, they become aligned, just like partners in a dance fall into step with one another. Adaptation brings things into a state of fitting with one another, being attuned to one another, so that they belong together and to each other.

Finally, an extremely significant source of evidence for how one ought to translate *Ereignis* comes from Heidegger's explicit remarks on translation. The proper translation of *Ereignis* into French was a point of discussion between Heidegger and the participants in the seminars in Le Thor held in 1969. Tellingly, *événement* – "event" – was not even considered. *Avènement*, "advent" or "arrival," was rejected as "wholly inapt for translating '*das Ereignis*'" (GA15:365/FS 60). The translation endorsed by Heidegger himself was "*appropriement*," a nominalization of the French verb *approprier*, which means "to adapt, to render proper for an end or purpose."[12] The *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française* gives the following illustrative examples of the verb:

* "to adapt the laws of a people to their customs"
* "to adapt remedies to the patient's constitution"
* "to adapt one's speech to circumstances, one's language to people"
* "It is necessary to adapt one's style to one's subject."[13]

When combined with the reflexive personal pronoun, *s'approprier can* mean the act of appropriating something – i.e., taking possession of property. But the nominalization of the verb that carries the sense of "appropriation" is the French *appropriation*. If Heidegger had understood *Ereignis* as appropriation, this would have been the proper translation. He opted instead for the quite distinct nominalization *appropriement*, which means "an arrangement suitable for," or "an adaptation to."[14] For me, Heidegger's explicit guidance on translation should be determinative: the best way to capture his own understanding of *Ereignis* in English is accordingly "adaptation."

---

[11] *Fügen*, incidentally, is defined by the *Deutsches Wörterbuch* through the Latin *aptō* – to fit together, to adapt or accommodate one thing to another. "Fügen," Grimm and Grimm 1878, part 1, 384.

[12] "Adapter, rendre propre à une destination," *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*, 8th ed., vol. 1 (Paris: Librairie Hachette, 1932), 71. See also *Trésor de la Langue Française*, 3rd ed. (Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1974), vol. III, 339, where *approprier* is defined as "to adapt to a specific use" ("adapter à un usage déterminé"). The Grimms offers *approprier* as a definitory translation of *eignen*; this might be the inspiration for Heidegger's translation of *Ereignis* as *appropriement*. See Grimm and Grimm 1862, 104.

[13] "Approprier les lois d'un peuple à ses mœurs." "Approprier les remèdes au tempérament du malade." "Approprier son discours aux circonstances, son langage aux personnes." "Il faut approprier le style au sujet que l'on traite." *Dictionnaire de l'Académie Française*, vol. I, 71.

[14] "Agencement approprié à, adaptation à," *Trésor*, vol. III, 339. I am indebted to Cécile Varry for her help with French translation.

In response to further questions regarding the meaning of *Ereignis* in the seminar, Heidegger noted that "the most suitable text for discussion of this question is the lecture 'Der Satz der Identität'" (GA15:366/FS 60). And in that essay, Heidegger explains that to understand *Ereignis*, "one must learn simply to experience this being adapted [*Eignen*] in which human beings and being are suited to each other [*einander ge-eignet*]" (GA11:45/HR 291).[15]

Mark A. Wrathall

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Primary texts devoted to working out an account of *Ereignis* include GA65, GA66, GA67, GA69, GA70, and GA71. *Ereignis* also receives significant treatment in a number of essays, including "Time and Being" (in GA14/OTB), "The Way to Language" (in GA12/OWL), "Building Dwelling Thinking" (in GA7/PLT), "The Principle of Identity" (in GA11/HR), and "The Onto-theo-logical Constitution of Metaphysics" (in GA11/ID).

FURTHER READING

Sheehan 2001, Sheehan 2015, Spinosa 2005, Wrathall and Lambeth 2011, Wrathall 2011

AFFAIR (*SACHE*). SEE MATTER, THE.

---

[15] Similar formulations are repeated in many other places; see, e.g., GA65:28–29.

7.
AFFORDANCE (*BEWANDTNIS*)

AN AFFORDANCE IS the opportunity to act that an environment offers an agent. Affordances are a function of, on the one hand, the projects, abilities, skills, and dispositions of the specific agent and, on the other hand, the possibilities furnished by the EQUIPMENT the agent encounters when that equipment is situated in a whole CONTEXT of equipment.

The WORLD we immediately inhabit, according to Heidegger, is not articulated into OCCUR-RENT objects with determinate properties. Instead, the basic structure of the lived world is what he calls a *Bewandtnisganzheit*, a WHOLE of affordances. The world thus shows up as a shifting[1] and richly interconnected context of opportunities and invitations to act. The AVAILABLE entities that we encounter are ontologically defined in terms of what they afford: "affordance is the being of innerworldly entities" (SZ 84). The particular affordances that are disclosed in any given situation are a function of three things: the equipment that is on hand, the kind of activities in which agents are absorbed, and of course the character of the particular agent him- or herself, including her skills and bodily constitution.[2]

There is considerable perplexity over the proper translation of the noun *Bewandtnis* into English, as there is with the associated passive verbal construction Heidegger uses, *bewenden lassen*. Macquarrie and Robinson translate these as "involvement" and "let be involved" respectively. Stambaugh translates them as "relevance" and "let be relevant." Hofstadter translates them as "functionality" and "letting function." Kisiel translates *Bewandtnis* as "deployment." This wide disparity in translations is a mark of the fact that Heidegger is using these words in a rather unconventional fashion, although the different translations all try to capture the fact that a *Bewandtnis* has to do with the way use-objects function in a particular setting or context.

In its archaic uses, *bewenden* meant "to use" or "to employ" a thing and it was a synonym for *anwenden* and *verwenden*.[3] The prefix *be-* in this case probably has the force of "supplying or endowing." *Be-wenden*, then, would mean "to supply or endow or offer something to be used or utilized." The use of the passive construction (*bewenden lassen*) indicates that it is the entities in the world which are themselves supplying or offering us their use, so as to open up to us a possibility for changing the circumstances through our actions.[4] The word *Bewandtnis* in the colloquial German of Heidegger's day meant the "conditions" or "circumstances" that attach to or determine a particular thing or state of affairs. The word was typically used in passive locutions: a condition (*Bewandtnis*) is had with (*bei* or *mit*) things. By combining these different senses – the sense of a use

---

[1] "It is precisely when we see the 'world' unsteadily and fitfully in accordance with our moods, that the available shows itself in its specific worldhood, which is never the same from day to day" (SZ 138).

[2] "Disclosedness ... concerns equiprimordially the world, being-in, and the self" (SZ 220).

[3] See "bewenden" in Grimm and Grimm 1854, 1782.

[4] In colloquial German, *bewenden lassen* means to let things be, to let affairs take their course, to acquiesce in the prevailing conditions. But in Heidegger's appropriation of the expression, this should not be heard as involving a lack of activity – we let equipment be by taking it up and using it in the way it invites us to.

31

offered to an agent, and the sense of those conditions that accompany some thing of use – Heidegger coins a term that names the way each thing in the world is encountered in terms of an environmentally- and agent-specific opportunity to act. Like English, German lacks a word that readily says this: we don't typically describe things as offering themselves for use. J.J. Gibson, in struggling to come up with an English word to express this thought of the "offerings of nature, these possibilities or opportunities," described them as "affordances," as in, "the door affords entry and egress" (Gibson 1986, 18).[5] Context suggests that Heidegger is trying to express the same notion with his term *Bewandtnis*. Heidegger always describes the *Bewandtnis* of an entity in terms of the activity or use it affords in a particular context. Something can be present in our world to the degree that we grasp what affordance it offers and that, Heidegger explains, is uncovered to the degree that we understand its use: "there lies in the having-it-present [of a thing] a knowing your way around in the affordance that is had with the present thing. The affordance, that is had with it, is uncovered to the degree that we live in a disclosure of it. Use is merely a more natural mode of the basic sense" – more basic, that is, than the sense grasped in understanding the meaning of a linguistic expression (GA21:143).

Thus, for instance, Heidegger points out that "the child's question 'What is this thing?' is answered by citing what it is used for, whereby one defines the current thing in terms of what one does with it" (GA20:359). The things we encounter in the world, Heidegger concludes, are "first authentically understood when one has entered into the affordance which is had with the environmental thing" (GA20:359). And he emphasizes that an affordance is defined simultaneously in terms of the way we are coping with things and the state of the environing world. What a particular thing affords, in other words, depends on the agent's coping activity in which (*womit*) it is employed, and the purposes for which (*wobei*) it is employed: "within the affordance is: letting use for something with something" (SZ 83). The clearest example Heidegger offers is that of the hammer: "with what we call a hammer," Heidegger explains, "an affordance for hammering is had." If I act on the affordance – if the hammer is taken up or employed in hammering – then "with the hammer ... an affordance for fastening is had." If I accept the invitation that the hammer, boards, and nails extend to me for fastening things together, in turn, then the hammer also will afford me (for instance) the activity of acquiring shelter against bad weather (SZ 83).

So when Heidegger says things like "with each particular entity an affordance is had" (see, e.g., GA24:233), he means that each thing is what it is only within the circumstances or conditions of its use – each entity offers to us a possibility of acting. The affordance a thing has isn't something that can be tacked onto it later. It is to an understanding of what it affords, however vague that understanding might be, that the entity can first show itself as the thing that it is.[6] For instance, the way a chair shows up in the everyday world is not: rigid, spatially extended object with a flat surface parallel to the floor. It is rather: an affordance for sitting. These affordances, the way things in the world offer themselves to be used by us, are contextually determined in two different dimensions. First, they are determined by the purposive context of the agent – the chair affords

[5] Gibson uses the term "affordance" in a somewhat broader sense than Heidegger's *Bewandtnis* to describe not just the human environment, but the environment of all animals. "The *affordances* of the environment," Gibson explains, "are what it *offers* the animal, what it *provides* or *furnishes*, either for good or ill. The verb *to afford* is found in the dictionary, the noun *affordance* is not. I have made it up. I mean by it something that refers to both the environment and the animal in a way that no existing term does. It implies the complementarity of the animal and the environment" (Gibson 1986, 127).

[6] See, for example, GA24:432: "The letting-be-used [*Bewendenlassen*], as the prior understanding of affordance, first of all allows the entity to be understood as the entity that it is."

sitting given my purpose of writing at the table. But if my purpose were to hang Christmas decorations, the chair would afford standing on and reaching. An affordance, in other words, is always *for* some end or goal. Second, affordances are determined by the "equipmental context" – by the other affordances that can be brought to bear on this affordance. So it is *with* nails that the hammer is *for* fastening pieces of wood together. As the equipmental contexts change (the *with*), so do the purposive contexts (that end or goal *for which* the affordance can serve). And vice versa – as the purposive context changes (as I project an affordance onto some new end), the relevant equipmental context will also change. In addition to being contextually determined, affordances, unlike objects, are inherently indexed to our skills and bodily capacities for action. "What we call a hammer" (SZ 84) would not afford hammering to a creature who lacked hands with opposable thumbs.

Thus, Heidegger argues that the entities that populate our everyday world show themselves as they are in themselves when we grasp them in terms of the activities they afford. They show up as being available, and they are structured by the place they hold in a whole network of reference relationships (they "refer" or send us to: the work or end product we are producing, the materials out of which they are constructed, the people who will put them to use, and the natural environment in which they are to function). The being of the available is affording. The structure of the available is reference (= the relationship of the "with . . . in . . ."). The world is the coherent, organized wholeness within which and against the background of which entities can afford activities and refer to each other.

Mark A. Wrathall

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA20:231, 359; GA21:143, 150, 231; GA23:21; SZ 80, 83–89, 111, 117, 123, 148, 150, 186, 261, 343, 353–56, 364, 368, 412; GA24:96, 149, 233, 248, 412–18, 421, 424, 432, 441; GA27:76, 84; GA41:72; GA54:133

FURTHER READING

Wrathall 2015b

8.
ALÊTHEIA

ʾΑλήθεια ɪs ᴛʜᴇ Greek word for ᴛʀᴜᴛʜ. Although it is frequently difficult to render ancient Greek words into modern European languages with great precision, in this case this translation is not particularly problematic or controversial.

Heidegger's critique of the concept of truth comprises two claims, one transcendental, the other historical. The transcendental claim is that not only our ordinary notion of truth as *correctness*, but moreover the theoretical conception of truth that has dominated the philosophical tradition since Aristotle, namely that it is a kind of *agreement* or *correspondence* of one thing (beliefs, propositions, the mind) with another (facts, states of affairs, the world), both presuppose a phenomenon he calls ᴜɴᴄᴏɴᴄᴇᴀʟᴍᴇɴᴛ, namely, that a world is open to us and things show up for us in some definite way. Heidegger's historical claim, for example in his 1940 essay "Plato's Doctrine of Truth," is that for the pre-Socratic thinkers and the poets of the Archaic period, *truth* (ἀλήθεια) meant unconcealment, and that it came to mean correctness (ὀρθότης) only in the cave allegory in Plato's *Republic*. "Ever since," Heidegger writes, "there is a striving for 'truth' in the sense of the correctness of the gaze and its orientation. Ever since, in all fundamental orientations toward entities, what becomes decisive is achieving a correct view of the ideas" (GA9:234/179).

Heidegger might be right that by the classical period an important transformation had occurred in the concept of truth, or whatever it was the Greeks meant by ἀλήθεια. But he was wrong, and later conceded as much, to insist that the word did not mean correctness prior to the fourth century ʙᴄᴇ. In fact, in a very late essay, "The End of Philosophy and the Task of Thinking" (1964), probably in response to Ernst Tugendhat's criticism, Heidegger seems to surrender much of the account he had been advancing for the previous four decades:

> Insofar as truth is understood in the traditional "natural" sense as the correspondence of cognition with entities, . . . ʾΑλήθεια, unconcealment in the sense of the opening, may not be equated with truth. Rather, ʾΑλήθεια, unconcealment thought as opening, first grants the possibility of truth. . . . ʾΑλήθεια, unconcealment thought as the opening of presence, is not yet truth. . . . To raise the question of ʾΑλήθεια, of unconcealment as such, is not the same as raising the question of truth. For this reason, it was inadequate and misleading to call ʾΑλήθεια in the sense of opening, truth. (GA14:85–86)

Do these remarks amount to a wholesale repudiation of his earlier view?

Not necessarily. Heidegger could be saying either of two things in this passage. Perhaps, appreciating the full force of Tugendhat's critique, he saw that unconcealment had nothing directly to do with truth, after all, so he decided simply to sever the connection between them. More plausibly, the passage can be read as Heidegger's admission that his choice of words and presentation had been confusing and had obscured his philosophical point. So, rather than disavowing the claim that unconcealment stands in an important relation to truth as we ordinarily understand it, and indeed in significant contrast to falsity, Heidegger could merely

be withdrawing the terminological gesture of widening the scope of *our* word "truth" (the German *Wahrheit*) to include unconcealment as well as correctness. For notice, in these remarks Heidegger still uses ἀλήθεια to mean unconcealment. This suggests that what he is giving up on is not the idea that by ἀλήθεια the Greeks understood unconcealment as well as correctness, but rather his own effort to broaden the sense of *our* word "truth" to include the entire range of phenomena that he thinks the Greeks understood by *their* word ἀλήθεια.

Even on that more conservative interpretation, however, Heidegger is clearly recanting an important part of his earlier view, namely, the historical claim that ἀλήθεια came to mean correctness only around the time Plato wrote the allegory of the cave. Following the comments above, Heidegger continues,

> we must acknowledge the fact that Ἀλήθεια, unconcealment in the sense of the opening of presence, was originally only experienced as ὀρθότης, as the correctness of representing and asserting. But then the claim concerning the essential transform-ation of truth, that is, from unconcealment to correctness, is also untenable. (GA14:87)

This could be a concession to critics like Paul Friedländer, who pointed out that Homer already understood truth as correctness and always used inflections of ἀλήθεια in connection with verbs of assertion, the object of which was not the unhidden, but "that which is not-crooked," in contrast to "everything that disturbs, distorts, slants" (Friedländer 1958, 223). In the funeral games near the end of the *Iliad*, for example, Achilles stations Phoenix at the turn post to spot the runners' positions and "announce the truth" (ἀληθείην ἀποείποι, 23.361). Phoenix's job is not to uncover or reveal something, but to watch carefully and report accurately who got around the post and who didn't.

In any case, even if the word ἀλήθεια did not assume an entirely new meaning in the fourth century BCE, Heidegger might still be right that it had a broader and richer content in the Archaic period than it and (roughly) equivalent words in other languages – *veritas*, *vérité*, *Wahrheit* – eventually came to have, especially in philosophical and scientific discourse. Moreover, admitting that ἀλήθεια, whatever else it might have signified, also meant correctness in Archaic poetry has the advantage of forestalling the objection that if the Greek word had little or nothing to do with *our* concept of truth, then "truth" is just a mistranslation of ἀλήθεια.[1] As we have seen, Heidegger was responsive to this point. Already in *Being and Time* and then again in 1964, he grants that the word "truth" fails to capture what he thinks is philosophically significant in the Archaic sense of ἀλήθεια, namely the uncovering of entities, the disclosedness of Dasein, and the unconcealment of being.

Taylor Carman

---

[1] Bernard Williams makes this point, though with only glancing reference to Heidegger, in Williams 2002, 272.

ALWAYS BEING MY OWN BEING (*JEMEINIGKEIT*). SEE MINENESS.

ALWAYS-BEING-MINE (*JEMEINIGKEIT*). SEE MINENESS.

ANALYZE (*ZERGLIEDERN*). SEE JOINTEDNESS.

ANGST (*ANGST*). SEE ANXIETY.

ANGUISH (*NOT*). SEE EMERGENCY.

ANTICIPATION (*VORGRIFF*). SEE FORE-STRUCTURE.

ANTICIPATION (*VORLAUFEN*). SEE DEATH.

ANTICIPATORY LEAP FORWARD AND RUNNING IN ADVANCE (*VORSPRUNG*). SEE LEAP.

9.
ANXIETY (*ANGST*) AND FEAR (*FURCHT*)

ANXIETY IS A FUNDAMENTAL DISPOSEDNESS or fundamental MOOD in which DASEIN is exposed to a threat in its own being. In contrast, fear is a mood in which a case of Dasein is open to threats in its environment. Heidegger analyzes fear (*Furcht*) in *Being and Time* in order to illustrate the phenomenon of disposedness and he analyzes anxiety (*Angst*, also translated as "angst" or "dread") in order to explain FALLING and reveal the unity of CARE. As a distinctive and originary disclosure of Dasein's being, anxiety is significant both existentially and methodologically. The most detailed treatments of anxiety are in *Being and Time* and the 1929 lecture, "What is Metaphysics?" (in GA9). These analyses are based on Heidegger's interpretations of Aristotle and Augustine on fear, and they are prefigured by discussions of the restlessness or anxiousness in Christian life, in the experience of philosophizing, and in factical life itself. Heidegger retains these three "levels" or "registers" in his later discussions of anxiety: the anxiety of AUTHENTICITY, that of PHENOMENOLOGY, and that of INTENTION-ALITY or openness itself.

In *Being and Time*, anxiety appears primarily as the mood of authenticity. Along with (hearing) the call of CONSCIENCE and the resolute anticipation of DEATH, it belongs to authentic self-disclosure. Thus "being-towards-death is essentially anxiety" (SZ 266), anxiety is in the face of death (SZ 251, 254, 265–66), and the caller of conscience is anxious (SZ 276ff.). But Heidegger wavers on whether authentic self-disclosure is anxious (SZ 266, 296) or instead ready for anxiety (SZ 301, 385; GA9:307/234, 311/237) (and at one point he suggests that the mood of authen-ticity is instead equanimity, SZ 345). On the one hand, experiencing anxiety allows one to be authentic (SZ 191, 344; GA9:113/89; cf. GA18:261), since anxiety exacts RESOLUTENESS of us (SZ 308); on the other, anxiety is that which resoluteness exacts of us (SZ 305, 322) and so is possible only for the authentic person (SZ 344).

Anxiety brings Dasein to authenticity by bringing it out of its fallen absorption in the world and individualizing it through a disclosure of its thrown being as care. It is a rare breakdown in a life (compare Jaspers's 'limit situation'), in which the world lacks significance and entities lack importance or involvement. As with tool breakdown, this breakdown allows us to see something previously obscure: when entities as a whole slip away, the NOTHING is revealed. Thus we say that anxiety is "about nothing." It is "about," in the sense that it reveals, the nothing and nowhere – no particular thing and no particular location, but that which makes entities and locations meaningful. Heidegger's claims about the nothing in "What is Metaphysics?" were famously criticized by Rudolf Carnap, who argued that "nothing" is meaningless when used as a substantive (Carnap 1931). But as Heidegger uses it, "the nothing" is another word for the WORLD as such, in its worldhood. Since the world belongs to Dasein's being, to say that anxiety reveals the nothing is to say that anxiety reveals Dasein's being as BEING-IN-THE-WORLD.

As such a revelation, anxiety is methodologically important in the existential analytic. It is by either imagining or experiencing angst that we can reverse and explain falling

self-concealing and come to see Dasein's unified being. In this sense, anxiety is the mood of phenomenology or philosophy. Indeed, one of Heidegger's earliest appeals to anxiety aims to explain certain mistakes in (Cartesian) philosophy and to implicitly motivate and clarify phenomenological method (GA17:288–90, 317–19). Like inauthenticity, such philosophical mistakes are based in Dasein's flight from its uncanny being, which threatens it. It follows that completing the existential analytic (SZ) or engaging in metaphysical questioning ("What is Metaphysics?") requires that anxiety be invoked or provoked and so that we face up to something threatening.

The threat in Dasein's being that anxiety reveals is UNCANNINESS, or THROWNNESS into death. What this threat is depends on what death is, and most interpretations start with this question. But Heidegger himself came to think anxiety from a different direction: by way of fear, the mood that reveals threats in our environment. Following Aristotle's account of emotion in the *Rhetoric*, Heidegger distinguishes:

* the in-the-face-of-which (*das Wovor*): some definite entity, posing a definite threat (detrimentality), and approaching;
* the about-which (*das Worum*): ourselves, in danger in some definite respect;
* the fearing as such: the mood in which environmental threats are first disclosed to us, and (listed separately at GA20:397) in which we are closed off from ourselves and our thrownness.

Following Kierkegaard (in *The Concept of Anxiety*), Heidegger takes anxiety to be unlike fear in that it is not *in the face of* anything determinate in the world or *about* any determinate threat to us. This is why it needs no particular setting to arise. From where, then, does anxiety arise?

While Luther and Kierkegaard both glimpsed the phenomenon of anxiety (GA20:404, SZ 190 n.4) (and even Aristotle had an intimation of it, GA18:192, 203), it is Augustine who gives Heidegger the crucial clue. In "On Fear," Augustine distinguishes *timor servilis* (servile fear) from *timor castus* (chaste fear). *Timor servilis* is "fear of the world" while *timor castus* is a "selfly fear" (GA60:297). Like *timor castus* and unlike fear, anxiety arises not from the world but from our own being. Thus:

* the in-the-face-of-which (*das Wovor*): indefinite; no particular entity. All entities are insignificant. *Das Wovor der Angst* is *nothing*: the world, and so our being-in-the-world.
* the about-which: not some definite, threatened ability-to-be, but Dasein's authentic ability-to-be-in-the-world as such, which Dasein is thus freed to take over.

Heidegger does not list the third element – the disclosure as such – separately in GA20, but in *Being and Time* he says that it coincides with the other two: it is being-in-the-world as such (SZ 188, 343). Being-in-the-world *is* anxiety. Anxiety is "constitutive of the being of Dasein *qua* care" (GA20:391) or at least "belongs to Dasein's essential state of being-in-the-world" (SZ 189). This is why in GA20 Heidegger appears to identify anxiety and being-in-the-world (GA20:404) and says that the "essence of anxiety is Dasein itself" (GA20:405). *This* anxiety must be our disclosive openness itself.

Further, *timor castus* is "the fear that you lose the good things"; it "does not have the direction of keeping something or someone at bay, but of pulling something or someone toward oneself" (GA60:297). In fear, we try to repel the threat. In anxiety, the threat repels us. Our uncanniness

repels us and propels us away from our being and toward innerworldly entities, which we pull toward ourselves. Thus anxiety grounds falling qua comporting to entities (SZ 184, 186; GA3:238; GA9:114ff./90ff., 122/96; GA20:392ff., 403).

In "What is Metaphysics?" the nothing revealed in anxiety is also "essentially repelling" (GA9:114/90); its nihilation "directs us precisely towards entities" (GA9:116/92) – although it repels entities as a whole as they slip away (GA9:114/90). Instead of propelling us toward entities and so into falling, the nothing repels entities away from Dasein and so opens it up to being. Thus anxiety is TRANSCENDENCE. In this way, the nothing – and so anxiety – "make[s] possible in advance the manifestness of entities in general" (GA9:114/ 90; cf. GA3:238).

Understood in this way, anxiety is "the fundamental occurrence of our Da-sein (GA9:110/87) – the "original manifestness" (GA9:115/91) that makes comporting toward entities possible. Apparently, even the Greeks took anxiety to be "co-constitutive of the manner and mode of grasping what is and what is not" (GA18:192). And just as fear, for Aristotle, brings us to speech and deliberation (GA18:261), so too anxiety first brings us to speech qua grounding existence and LANGUAGE (GA17:317; GA18:261). As the transcendence beyond entities to being, and so the METAPHYSICS that is the happening of Dasein itself (GA9:122/96; GA3:283), anxiety is the ground of all philosophical and scientific questioning (GA9:121/95).

When falling Dasein covers over its transcendent being, misunderstanding itself, it suppresses (GA9:117/93) or conceals (GA9:118/93; GA20:391) anxiety – although anxiety is already implicit (GA20:404), concealed (GA9:118/93), or latent (SZ 189, 192) (and the nothing "nihilates incessantly," GA9:116/92). Such latency is unintelligible if anxiety is a mood of breakdown. Thus we must distinguish anxiety qua transcendent openness from anxiety qua the mood of authenticity. The latter is an experience that disrupts inauthentic falling. The former grounds falling, both qua the cover-up of our own being and qua our comporting toward entities (including fearing). We must also distinguish these (at least provisionally) from a third phenomenon: anxiety qua the mood of phenomenology, which must be invoked or experienced in philosophizing if we are to adequately grasp Dasein's being. Is this a matter of reflecting on or experiencing a breakdown, or of invoking a concealed transcendence? These three "levels" of anxiety correspond to the three "levels" at which Dasein goes beyond entities (*meta ta phusika*) to being: in its philosophizing, in its authenticity, and in its very openness.

Katherine Withy

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Angst GA3:237ff., 283ff.; SZ §40, 251, 254, 265–66, 276, 296, §68(b); "What is Metaphysics?" and "Postscript to 'What is Metaphysics?'" in GA9:307/234; GA17:§50c, Supplement 30; GA18:192, 203, 261; GA20:§30b–c.
Fear SZ §30, §68(b); GA18:§21; GA20:§30a.
Fear in Aristotle SZ 341ff.; GA18:§21; GA20:§30.a.α.
Fear in Augustine SZ 190 n.iv; GA18:178, 261; GA20:393, 404; GA60: Appendix II §7.

10.
ANYONE, THE (*DAS MAN*)

T HE ANYONE REFERS to an understanding or set of understandings of how we ought to think, value, and act. It is rooted in the society to which we belong though not specifically attributable to any particular members of that society; and it "dominates" our actions in our inauthentic EVERYDAYNESS (SZ 126). The anyone is "the 'Realest subject' of everyday-ness" – "the agency through which most things come about" – while Dasein "stands in *subjection*"; Dasein remains, of course, active here – indeed "busying [it]self head over heels"; but "Dasein is *not* itself" (SZ 128, 127, 126, 345, 317). The anyone "prescribes the kind of being of everydayness," "reliev[ing] Dasein of its choice, its formation of judgments, and its estimation of values"; it "determines how and what one 'sees'" and "governs every interpretation of the world and of Dasein" (SZ 126, 170; GA20:340). Thereby, "everything gets obscured," as Dasein is blinded to "the 'heart of the MATTER' [*auf die Sachen*]" and to its "concrete Situation" (SZ 127, 302, 300). Dasein is "lost," "absorbed in," and "tranquilized" by the anyone (SZ 175, 167, 177), though – as the latter of these expressions suggests – such a condition is also one to which we are drawn. The anyone "allows all responsibility to be foisted onto itself," "disburdening" Dasein by depriving it of its "answerability" (GA20:340; SZ 127). "Dasein *flees* in the face of itself into the anyone" (SZ 322); it "voluntarily surrenders" (GA64:27).

The anyone, *das Man*, and the associated notion of *the anyone-self*, *das Man-selbst*, are concepts that figure prominently in Heidegger's early work and are among its most controversial. The expression "*das Man*" is Heidegger's distinctive nominalization of the impersonal pronoun "*man*" – the equivalent of "*on*" in French. English lacks a simple equivalent, which has made its translation a subject of some debate. Heidegger says that when inauthentic "We take pleasure and enjoy ourselves as *man* takes pleasure" (SZ 126–27) – "as they take pleasure" or "as one takes pleasure," we might say. But translating "*das Man*" as "the One" seems very misleading – evoking Parmenidean or Neoplatonic visions – and "the They" (which was Macquarrie and Robinson's choice in their version of SZ) seems to make of *das Man* some particular group of other beings exerting their influence upon the rest of us, something which Heidegger specifically denies. In several discussions (for example, in SZ and GA20), Heidegger first introduces the concept of being-with-others and then introduces *das Man*, talking of Dasein "stand[ing] in *subjection* by others," its "being [being] taken away by the others" (SZ 126). But he goes on to state explicitly that "These others ... are not definite others": "On the contrary, any others could represent them" (SZ 126). *Das Man* "is not this one, not that one, not oneself, not some people, and not the sum of them all"; indeed Heidegger goes as far as to insist that "*das Man* ... is the *nobody* [*das Niemand*]" (SZ 126, 128). (To use Carman's nice expression, "*das Man*" is thus an "anti-personification," Carman 1994, 213.) In the light of these difficulties that the obvious candidates face, translators have rendered *das Man* as, for example, "the everyone" and "the anyone," with the latter increasingly popular in recent work.

Heidegger embeds his exploration of the anyone in his complex discussion of AUTHENTI-CITY, a discussion that draws on many challenging, interrelated concepts such as ambiguity, anticipation, ANXIETY, being-towards-DEATH, CONSCIENCE, FALLING, IDLE TALK, RESO-LUTENESS, etc. Discussion of these concepts here is impossible but we will touch briefly on some of those most closely connected to the anyone: "AVERAGENESS" (*Durchschnittlichkeit*), "LEVELING off" (*Einebnen*), and "distantiality" (*Abständigkeit*), which Heidegger labels collectively as "PUBLICNESS" (*Öffentlichkeit*, SZ 127). Heidegger's discussion of authenticity is itself nested within broader explorations of Dasein's BEING-IN-THE-WORLD, its being-with-others, its TEMPORALITY, and its historicality, as well as within reflections on the character of philosophy and the "question of being." This embedding not only means that our appreciation of what is at stake in the anyone rests on a very extensive background that it is difficult to fathom and keep in focus. It has also generated worries over whether the anyone might actually stand in tension with themes articulated in that background.

For example, Heidegger's widely lauded critique of Cartesianism depicts human beings as essentially embedded within a social, historical, and cultural world. Yet Heidegger seems to undo this good work when he depicts our everyday, public life as an inauthentic "absorption" of Dasein in the anyone. Symptomatic of this tension are knots into which Heidegger is often seen as tying himself in his reflections on the anyone, and I will offer two examples. First, many commentators (see, e.g., Carman 1994, 213) feel that Heidegger contradicts himself when he says, on the one hand, that "*authentic being-one's-self*" is "*an existentiell modification of* the anyone," and on the other, that "the anyone-self . . . is an existentiell modification of the authentic self" (SZ 130, 317). Which is the prior phenomenon – these commentators ask – the anyone or the authentic self? Second, while associating the anyone with our inauthentic existence, Heidegger also insists that the anyone "*is an existentiale*," the term he reserves for concepts that articulate Dasein's fundamental ontological make-up; the anyone, he tells us, is "*a primordial phenomenon*": "*it belongs to Dasein's positive constitution*" (SZ 129). But such a depiction makes it hard to attach sense to the notion that one might somehow escape the influence of the anyone, which authenticity might seem to require.

Such tensions have led to a juxtaposition of what can be called "structural" and "psychological" accounts of the anyone. The former stress the anyone's character as a feature of all forms of Dasein's existence and garner support from – among other things – Heidegger's treatment of being-with-others, according to which we experience the environing world as always already also the environment of other Dasein. For example, AVAILABLE entities "are encountered from out of the world in which they are available for others":

> If [an object] is available, then there lies in the kind of being which belongs to it (that is in its AFFORDANCE) an essential assignment or reference to possible wearers, for instance, for whom it should be cut to the figure. Similarly, when material is put to use, we encounter its producer or supplier as one who "serves" well or badly. (SZ 117–18)

In these ways, such entities "refer" to other Dasein; but they do not single out any in particular, but merely "wearers," "producers," and "suppliers." Similarly, when I experience an entity as a hammer I experience it as an entity fit to be used by an indefinite number of different Dasein, rather than – say – only by me or you. There is in our dealings here what one might call a certain "averageness," a *Durchschnittlichkeit* with its literal connotation of being "dividable through":

with such an encounter with available entities, we can "divide through" by whoever is as a matter of fact their wearers, producers, or suppliers, in that any number of other individuals could play such roles, and it would reveal a misunderstanding of these entities to think otherwise.

Similarly, there is a certain "leveling" required in our use of such entities: a fine craftsman may use a hammer in ways in which others do not, but if the person before us uses it to prop open a door or to weigh down a pile of papers, then we'd say they were not using it *as* a hammer. To do that is instead to conform to certain publicly recognized norms of use for those objects: it is to use them as anyone [*man*] does, as one does. Mastering such norms is then bringing one's own conduct into line with the broader community of users who follow those norms – a levelling that requires "distantiality" (*Abständigkeit*), a minimizing of one's distance (*Abstand*) from those other users.

"Subjection" to such norms may now seem of a fundamentally innocent sort; but all the better for being so, advocates of such a structural view will argue, if "the anyone [is] *an essential existentiale*" (SZ 168). Such norms do indeed have a plausible claim to articulate our basic understanding of the world around us; and to think one might – in some way – throw off the "yoke" of such norms – their demand, for example, that one hit the nail with the heavy metal end of the hammer – would simply be to fail to understand what such norms are. Or so advocates of such structural accounts will argue.

Psychological accounts, on the other hand, focus on Heidegger's apparent suggestion that, while the inauthentic are "lost" in, and "tranquilized" by, the anyone, the authentic are not. The latter are not subject to the anyone's "domination," wresting back from it their "choice, . . . formation of judgments, and . . . estimation of values." They refuse to be "disburdened" by the anyone and hence remain "answerable" for their actions. Such accounts reject the notion that the anyone can somehow be a "structural" feature of Dasein on the grounds that Heidegger clearly seems to see authenticity as possible, which requires – or so such an account might insist – some kind of escape from the anyone.

In many respects, such accounts seem much closer to the text. Structural accounts depict our publicness as a fundamental aspect of what it is to be Dasein in all its forms. But this seems out of kilter with the dominant rhetoric of Heidegger's discussions of "averageness" – with their evocation of "an insensitivity to all distinctions in level and genuineness" – and of "leveling" and "distantiality" – with the "exceptional" and "original" being "quietly suppressed" (GA20:339; GA64:27). There seems to be a clear insinuation in such passages that such "insensitivity" and "suppression" are not inevitable, inescapable, "structural" features of Dasein's existence. It is well known, of course, that Heidegger insists that his talk of our "being lost . . . does not have a negative, depreciative significance" (GA24:228) and that his talk of "falling" "does not express any negative evaluation" (SZ 175). But nonetheless, as we saw from our very first paragraph above, his presentation of the "dictatorship of the anyone" (SZ 126) seems deafeningly condemnatory.

Psychological accounts certainly face interpretive and philosophical challenges. In their depiction of the anyone as an existentiale, structural accounts accommodate the norm-saturated existence that Heidegger seems to see for Dasein. Psychological accounts need to accommodate that too, while also explaining what the life of the authentic can look like in rejecting the "domination" of the anyone. For example, if the authentic person is to be thought of as rejecting norms such as those alluded to above, then she would appear either simply unintelligible or bizarrely eccentric. But if, on the other hand, she does not reject such

norms, what does she do? How – to raise a related interpretive question – can "authentic being-one's-self" be a "modification of the anyone"?

The corresponding difficulty for structural accounts is to explain the overwhelmingly condemnatory tone of Heidegger's descriptions of the anyone: they must provide *some* sense to the notion of an escape from its "domination." Hence, Dreyfus, for example, argued in his *Being-in-the-World* that "average everyday intelligibility" – of the sort that our equipmental norms articulate – "obscures . . . that it is *merely* average everyday intelligibility," and that authenticity requires of us that we recognize that this "ultimate 'ground' of intelligibility is simply shared practices"; what makes us inauthentic, according to this view, is not conformity to such norms but treating them – and this life of ours that they articulate – as if it had some deeper foundation or justification in, say, "God's goodness, human nature, or . . . solid good sense" (Dreyfus 1991, 156–57).

Nevertheless, Dreyfus's overall view in his *Being-in-the-World* is that ultimately Heidegger's "account of inauthenticity [is] incoherent" (Dreyfus 1991, 333). Whether such a view is justified – as Dreyfus himself has come to wonder (see, e.g., Dreyfus 2000) – is an issue we cannot resolve here. Nor can we here arbitrate more generally between structural and psychological approaches, or the many readings that attempt to accommodate elements of both. What I will do instead is propose that we may get some perspective on the issues raised above by considering how Heidegger came to the notion of "the anyone."

Heidegger's first use of that precise expression would seem to be in 1923's *Ontology – the Hermeneutics of Facticity* lectures (see, e.g., GA63:17, 31–32, 85), alongside an expression naturally translated as "leveling" – *Nivellierung* – playing something like the role of the later "*Einebnung*" in describing Dasein's "disappearance in the habits, customs and publicness of everydayness" (GA63:103). ("*Einebnung*" itself finds a use in the 1923–24 *Introduction to Phenomenological Research* lectures, GA17:283, 284, 286, but not that which it has in the later discussion of the anyone; the latter use seems to emerge in the 1924 essay and lecture that are both entitled "The Concept of Time," GA64:27, 41, 114/9.)

We can trace the origin of other elements of the jigsaw back further. We find a formulation of something akin to the notion of "distantiation" in the 1921–22 *Phenomenological Interpretations of Aristotle* lectures (GA61:102–05); and in the 1922 "Phenomenological Interpretations in Connection with Aristotle" essay, we read:

> The factical life of the individual . . . is for the most part not lived as such. Rather, it moves within a certain *averageness* that belongs to its caring, its going about its dealings, its circumspection, and its understanding of the world. This averageness is that of the reigning *publicness* at any particular time, of the social environs, the dominant trends, the "just like the others." It is this "anyone" [*Das "man" ist es*] that factically lives the life of the individual. (GA62:358/118)

This essay also identifies "this 'anyone'" with "the nobody": "Factical life is lived by the '*nobody*' [*Niemand*]" (GA62:358/118).

Yet we can arguably trace the ideas that the notion of the anyone helps articulate back further still. In the summer semester of 1921, Heidegger lectured on St. Augustine, and a central theme there is "view[ing oneself] in the eyes, the claims, judgments [and] tastes . . . of others" (GA60:229). By doing so, we "fall into the communal world" as we seek a "communal-worldly standing of validity" (GA60:236, 232). In this condition, "the real source of motivation

for one's life concentrates itself fully on one's standing of validity in the communal world" (GA60:233). Through what would seem to be an anticipation of a "leveling" or "distantiation" – "*concern over being different from* [*others*], even if only to equalize that difference" (GA20:337) – we subjugate our acts to the opinion of others in "bustling activity for the sake of praise" (GA60:232). This is a form of "absorption," in which we are "lived by the world" – by those by whom we are "held in validation" (GA60:228, 233) – just as we are later characterized by Heidegger as being "busily" "absorbed in" and "lived by" the anyone (SZ 345, 167, 299).

The later juxtaposition of authentic Dasein's "win[ning] itself" with an inauthentic "lostness in the 'anyone'" (SZ 268) also finds an anticipation in this earlier discussion in an examination of "the possibility of losing and of winning oneself": a "radical self-possession" juxtaposed with a "fall from the self" in which "the self is lost" (GA60:246, 254, 239–40). Heidegger tells us that, when authentic, we fulfill our "ownmost ABILITY-TO-BE-a-self"; and he paints a particular picture of what it is to "accomplish" a self and of what it is to fail to do so (SZ 273, 268). That picture also seems to emerge first in the St. Augustine lectures.

In our pursuit of praise, "we are scattered into the many"; we are "dispersed" and "dissolv[e] into the manifold" (GA60:205). This contrasts with "continence," "the over-coming and the halting of the fall" into the many, a "counter-movement against the dispersion, against the falling apart of life" (GA60:205, 237). This seems to anticipate Heidegger's later depiction of life lived under the "subjection" of the anyone as one of "dispersal," "distraction," and "disconnectedness" (SZ 390, 347, 371). It is a life of "inconstancy" (*Unständigkeit*), in which one is "absorbed in the everyday multiplicity and the rapid succession" of a "jumble of hovering possibilities," "drift[ing] back and forth between 'worldly' possibilities upon which [one] has not seized" (SZ 337, 321, 342, 344). As the inauthentic move from one context to the next – each such context with its own ambient norms sanctioned by the anyone – we are – as Heidegger puts it in the 1921–22 Aristotle lectures – "transported":

> The realms of significance which are encountered in the course of the maturation of life, and which become different as the world changes, transport life.... Life abandons itself to a certain pressure exerted by the world ... [and] becomes *dispersed*.... Life becomes played out in its world at random, following whatever comes "out of the blue." (GA61:101)

Hence, "Dasein in the anyone moves as it were in a whirlwind," "whirl[ing] it into the anyone, and thus tear[ing] it away from what matters and from itself," "draw[n] into the constancy of being deflected from its course" (GA20:388), to the point indeed that we struggle to identify such a "course" and an understanding in such a person of "what matters" that is genuinely his own. "The inauthentic being of *Dasein*" is "*als unganzes*" – as "*less* than a *whole*," or as Stambaugh puts it, "fragmentary" (SZ 233). The "*falling away of Dasein from its authenticity*" – "the disappearance of *Dasein* in the anyone" – is "a *falling apart* of *Dasein*" (GA20:390).

The St. Augustine lectures also suggest a motivation for this "dispersal." A deeper root of our "communal-worldly desire to be validated" is a desire to be "praised instead of praising" (GA60:245, 233) – to be free from the need to oneself judge. If I myself judge, "I see, I am clear about, what I choose and prefer" (GA60:235). But for that, of course, one can then be held accountable, whereas by not judging, one "hide[s] oneself" (GA60:229); as in the later

discussion, by being "relieved" "of one's choice, . . . judgments, . . . estimation of values," one "disburdens" oneself of "answerability."

Moreover, in judging what must be done, one raises a question with immediate bearing on one's own actions: is one *doing* what one believes must be done? But in "cowardly weakness and insecurity," I may "not [be] willing to observe myself" (GA60:229, 284). Heidegger identifies one's judgments when inauthentic with "idle talk," which is a "mode of *covering up*" (GA20:377); and if I do not want "to be discovered by" the truth – uncovered as acting as I believe I should or failing to do so – then I must "close myself off against" the truth, by living instead in (no more than) the opinion of others (GA60:201). In a second sense then, my not judging hides me – allows "the self [to be] lost for itself" (GA60:229).

But "view[ing oneself] in the eyes, the claims, judgments [and] tastes . . . of others" – instead of "rejoic[ing] in one's genuine ability to praise" and, of course, to blame – does expose one then to the risk of being "torn apart" (GA60:236, 250): there is no reason to think that those many eyes will see the same things as praiseworthy or blameworthy. This gives us a sense of why the anyone cannot be identified with determinate others, and – to turn finally to the anyone-self, "the self of everyday Dasein . . . which we distinguish from the *authentic self*" (SZ 129) – why the anyone-self is, so to speak, a non-self. The anyone is "the 'realest subject' of everydayness" but still less than a subject, in that our everyday "subjection" to it is to a "jumble of hovering possibilities." To be relieved of one's judgment by some determinate Other or Others might be seen as making them the true authors – "the real subjects" – of one's actions. But the anyone is instead an indefinite manifold: "the anyone is precisely *the who which all and none are*, the being of which it can always be said, 'It was really no one'" (GA20:340). For that reason, the anyone is *only* "the 'real*est* subject' of everydayness":

> It remains indefinite who has "really" done the choosing. So Dasein makes no choices, gets carried along by the nobody, and thus ensnares itself in inauthenticity (SZ 268).

One way of understanding the anyone-self is as what is left once the anyone has "torn apart" the self. In place of a genuine author of actions, we see the playing out in a person's behaviour of the shifting and inconsistent demands of the anyone, a "life . . . played out in its world at random, following whatever comes 'out of the blue.'" In place of a unified and unifying self, we find something "fragmentary," "indefinite and empty" – "the inconstancy of the anyone-self" (SZ 322, 391) and of the dispersed jumble of voices that correspond to "the multiplicity of the significances of factical life" (GA60:280) through which the inauthentic person is "transported." In this condition,

> What someone is, and how he is, is nobody: no one and yet everyone with one another. Everyone is not himself. (GA64:113/8–9)

The perspective that this comparison with the earlier St. Augustine lectures offers suggests a way of thinking about the knots mentioned above in which Heidegger supposedly ties himself. First, we should note that there is actually no simple contradiction in "*authentic being-one's-self*" being "*an existentiell modification of* the anyone," and "the anyone-self" "an existentiell modification of the authentic self." Even assuming we have a clear enough grasp on the relation of "being a modification of" that we can know with confidence that it cannot possibly be reflexive, we would still only find a contradiction here if we could identify "authentic being-one's-self" with "the authentic self" and the anyone with the anyone-self, both of which look to be (different)

category errors: being oneself is not itself a self, and I have proposed above that the anyone-self be seen as the upshot of the "domination" of the anyone.

The priority question that underlies the above sense of a tension remains though, and I will suggest here briefly one possible response. Another key theme from the St. Augustine lectures is appropriation – making one's own (see, e.g., GA60:173, 197, 200, 204, 251, 266, 290). "*Authentic being-one's-self*" – *eigentliche Selbstsein* – could be seen as Dasein's appropriating – "seizing upon," as SZ 344 quoted above puts it – particular possibilities that the anyone offers to it; the anyone would fail to "dominate" Dasein, however, if it is not then "transported" to other "possibilities" as it enters different "realms of significance." The possibilities upon which Dasein acts may originate in the anyone, and may not be "its own" in the sense of being its own invention: it is – let us recall – a theme in Heidegger's discussion of guilt that Dasein finds itself "thrown" into ranges of possibilities that it does not create, that "Dasein constantly lags behind its possibilities" (SZ 284). But particular such possibilities may still be "its own" if it appropriates them into its life such that they inform an overall sense of how to live which guides its life as a whole. Such an individual would exhibit "constancy" (*Ständigkeit*) and "steadfastness" (*Standfestigkeit*), her "having achieved some sort of a position [*Standgewonnenhaben*]" (SZ 322), even if the "material" from which her "position" was constructed she inherited from the anyone.

"*Authentic being-one's-self*" would then be "*an existentiell modification of* the anyone" and – to bring in the second "knot" identified above – the anyone "*an existentiale*," in the sense of an essential background against which Dasein's being authentic or inauthentic is played out: the possibilities it draws from the anyone being ones it (authentically) makes its own or merely ones it (inauthentically) temporarily adopts till it is "transported" on to others. From this perspective, the anyone-self may not be "an existentiell modification of the authentic self" in the sense of something that can only emerge through a "modification" of some already existing authentic self; but it can be seen as the fate of Dasein who could otherwise have achieved a "continent" "holding together" as such a self: the anyone-self is what we find if such a self "falls apart" or fails ever to coalesce. Neither the authentic nor the inauthentic escape the anyone then: it is indeed a "structural" feature of Dasein. But it is only domination by "the jumble of hovering possibilities" that is the anyone that yields the anyone-self.

Needless to say, opinions will differ among readers over whether one might make good on the above sketch of a resolution of these tensions. There is also much more to say about these concepts, including, for example, about the distinctive relationship towards our finitude that the domination of the anyone involves. The anyone "brings Dasein a *tranquillity* . . . [in which] all doors are open"; "everything is within its reach" as it "float[s] unattached" and "uprooted," "*never dwelling anywhere*" (SZ 177, 170, 173). But such a tranquil renunciation of the need for judgment – for appropriation of particular possibilities from among the anyone's seemingly "endless multiplicity" – also requires that "the anyone covers up . . . death's certainty," and the fact that "*it is possible at any moment*" (SZ 385, 258). It can appear that "all doors are open" only if – as the anyone must insist – Dasein "always has more time" (SZ 424). But a proper discussion of these matters is impossible here. (I make some suggestions about how one might view them in McManus 2015a and 2015b.)

Many of the concepts that Heidegger uses in *Being and Time* to articulate authenticity disappear from his work after the publication of that book. Underlying themes from that discussion certainly remain, modulated through Heidegger's later concerns; but much of the characteristic terminology of that earlier discussion – the anyone and the anyone-self included – vanishes. One hears echoes in later comments on "the normal human being": the "eternal

average [*der ewige Durchschnitt*]" who "takes his petty pleasures as the measure of what joy should be," "his shallow fears as the measure of what terror and anxiety should be," and "his smug comforts as the measure of what security and insecurity can be" (GA29/30:32). Heidegger also mentions the anyone in retrospective comments on his earlier work, such as in the discussion in the "Letter on 'Humanism'" of "the dictatorship of the public realm, which decides in advance what is intelligible and what must be rejected as unintelligible" (GA9:317/242). But largely, and for good or ill, the notions of the anyone and the anyone-self fade from view as Heidegger's interests move on.

Denis McManus

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ §27, 35–38; GA20 §26b; GA63 §6; GA64:26–30, 113–14

FURTHER READING

Carman 1994, Dreyfus 1991, Dreyfus 2000, McManus 2015a, McManus 2015b

<p style="text-align:center;">APOPHANTICAL AS (APOPHANTISCHE ALS). SEE AS-STRUCTURE.</p>

<p style="text-align:center;">APPARITION (ERSCHEINUNG). SEE APPEARANCE.</p>

<p style="text-align:center;">APPEAR (SCHEINEN). SEE SEEMING.</p>

<p style="text-align:center;">APPEARANCE (SCHEIN). SEE SEEMING.</p>

11.
APPEARANCE (*ERSCHEINUNG*)

An appearance is an occurrence that announces or indicates something else or refers to it, with the latter not showing itself as it is in itself. In *Being and Time* and in related works, Heidegger distinguishes between appearance on the one hand, and the phenomenon as well as seeming on the other. A phenomenon – by definition – does show itself as it is in itself, while a "seeming" pretends to do so. Later on, Heidegger drops this differentiation and identifies appearance mainly with manifestation or – more literally – preview (*Vorschein*) which is a mode of seeming and expresses being (GA40:107/105). Apart from that, "appearance" is repeatedly used as a technical term of Kantian philosophy and also without an explicit philosophical meaning altogether throughout all periods of Heidegger's writing.

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger gives as examples for the kind of reference that is typical for appearances all "indications, presentations, symptoms, and symbols" (SZ 29; cf. GA20:112). Consequently, there is a clear divide between what represents and what is represented in an appearance. "Appearing is a *not-showing-itself*" (SZ 29) of that which appears in the appearance. Still, the appearance depends on the phenomenon, i.e., the showing itself, because the symptom, symbol, etc. needs to show itself in order to refer to something else, e.g., a disease, which does not show itself. "According to this, phenomena are *never* appearances, though on the other hand every appearance is dependent on phenomena.... [W]hat does the referring (or the announcing) can fulfil its possible function only if it shows itself in itself and is thus a 'phenomenon'" (SZ 30ff.; cf. GA20:113).

Citing Kant's distinction of phenomenon (i.e. appearance) and noumenon, Heidegger criticises a usage of appearance that assigns to it the status of a "degraded entity" in contrast to the essence which just announces itself in the appearance but remains inaccessible (GA20 114; cf. SZ 30ff.). "One such thing which does not, itself, appear – a 'thing in itself' in other words – is, according to Kant, the world as a totality. Another such example is God himself" (GA5:5/4). Heidegger remarks that an "ontic" interpretation of the appearance–essence relation implies that the essence "stands behind" the (mere) appearance. Yet, by and large, "we do not learn from philosophy what this standing behind the scenes really means" (GA20:114).

The critique of Kant's concept of appearance did not always take such a strong form. In the lecture course *The Essence of Truth* from the winter of 1931/32, Heidegger remarks that Schleiermacher translates the Greek *φαντασία* "quite correctly as 'appearance'" if by appearance we understand the self-showing which was reserved for phenomena in *Being and Time* and is now called "the genuinely Kantian concept of 'appearance'" (GA34:163ff.).

The Kantian influence is also detectable in Heidegger's own conceptualization of appearing as "an essential consequence of presencing [*Anwesen*] and of its nature" (GA5:370/279).[1] In

---

[1] But cf. a fragmentary note in the seminar on Nietzsche in 1937 (GA87:101) that marks the distinctive feature of Heidegger's position: "The appearing not from the 'senses' and their 'data' but from the presencing of ... and that [presencing] in temporality; this concept neither in Kant nor in Nietzsche, also not *Hegel*."

"The Origin of the Work of Art," this relation that necessarily involves human perception is already expressed without explicit reference to presencing itself. "In the appearance of things, we never really perceive a throng of sensations, e.g. tones and noises, as it [i.e., the concept of the thing] purports. Rather, we hear the storm whistling in the chimney, the three-motored plane, the Mercedes which is immediately different from the Adler" (GA5:10/8). To Heidegger, this is a consequence of language which, "by naming entities for the first time, first brings entities to word and to appearance. . . . Such saying is a projection of the CLEARING in which announcement is made as to what entities will come into the open as" (GA5:61/46). Even truth appears in poetry and works of art in general. "This appearing . . . is beauty" (GA5:69/52).

In the early 1940s, Heidegger wrote two essays that show the influence of Plato and Hegel on his later concept in GA40 of appearance as a preview (*Vorschein*) of something. In *Plato's Doctrine of Truth*, he gives an interpretation of the allegory of the cave that accentuates the metaphor of light and shining. Appearing is a mode of accessibility and showing itself which culminates in the idea (cf. GA9:225/172). For, "in Greek thinking the 'ideas' enable something to appear in what it is and thus be present [*Anwesen*] in its constancy" (GA9:228/175). Even though already in Plato, "the inquiry into what is unhidden shifts in the direction of the appearing of the visible form . . . and toward the correctness of seeing" (GA9:231/177), now "BEING, as something present, has being precisely by appearing" (*ibid*.). The 1942/43 winter lecture on Parmenides elaborates this point further. Here, Heidegger analyzes two combined aspects of the Greek notion of appearing: "appearance in the sense of emerging and coming forth," i.e., of *phusis*, and "appearance in the sense of self-showing to a perception or a 'soul'" (GA54:206ff.). The history of philosophy privileged the second aspect one-sidedly. Heidegger stresses the cohesion of the two aspects and the importance of temporality in this context since "time has its essence in [. . .] letting appear and taking back" (GA54:210).

In *Hegel's Concept of Experience*, Heidegger gives these insights a methodological twist. The reconstruction of the method in Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* shows the necessity of knowledge as it appears (*erscheinendes Wissen*) for any knowledge. "The reality of . . . real knowledge . . . is appearance itself" (GA5:146/110). Appearance is not a deformation of something or some idea "behind it" (cf. GA9:225/173) but the preview (*Vorschein*) of a being. Thus, science, i.e., phenomenology as conceived before Husserl, "may come on the scene only by accomplishing the presentation of knowledge as it appears . . ., i.e., the not yet true knowledge within the truth of absolute knowledge" (GA5:140ff./105ff.).

Christian Schmidt

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

appearance as φαντασία GA5:106/80
φαίνειν as "letting appear" GA54:54, 202, 210; see also GA9:74/58ff.

12.
APPERCEPTION (APPERZEPTION)

APPERCEPTION IS THE ability to identify a stable domain of objects in reference to a stable (i.e., temporally extended) sense of self. Heidegger borrows the term "apperception" from Husserl and Kant (who borrowed it, in turn, from Leibniz). Heidegger's use of this term sheds light on his interpretation of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason*, his interpretive disagreements with the neo-Kantians, and his own criticism of Kant's account of the self.

Heidegger suggests that Kant's doctrine of apperception follows the Cartesian tradition of privileging self-consciousness (GA24:177). For Kant, transcendental apperception refers to the a priori unity of our CONSCIOUSNESS. Kant argues that this a priori unity is required for us to experience objects; all of our judgments must be preceded by an "I think." In other words, apperception is, for Kant, the unified perspective from which we make judgments about our experience, such that it "does not belong in every moment to a completely different 'I' which no longer knows of itself and of its previous moment" (GA25:378). In opposition to neo-Kantians like Rickert – and indeed, Kant's own portrayal of apperception as a "logical ego" – Heidegger maintains that the "ego of apperception" is not "a logical abstraction, something universal, nameless, unreal" (GA24:183; see also SZ 319). Heidegger's major innovation is to suggest that apperception is not linked to an abstract subject, outside of time; rather, apperception is fundamentally temporal.

Heidegger glosses the "I think" of transcendental apperception as an ability, or an "I can" (GA3:79). From the perspective of a unified subject, an object *can* appear, as something that is itself unified, opposed to the SUBJECT and spatiotemporally connected to other OBJECTS. As an a priori structure of human cognition, apperception unifies in advance, separate from any particular experience; apperception, then, anticipates a unified experience of given empirical objects. Heidegger argues, then, that apperception is temporal in that it involves anticipating a future of a certain kind – a world that is populated by certain kinds of objects, which stand opposed to a knowing subject. Anticipating a world of a certain kind in advance, one's prior expectations enable and shape one's encounter with particular empirical objects.

In an illuminating passage, Heidegger compares apperception to a moral disposition. Heidegger argues that moral disposition is not a "quality" that we possess, but an ability (GA25:375). We have a certain moral disposition when we can interpret the world in light of that disposition. When we are charitable, say, we can discern the charitable course of action. The moral disposition orients one's taking of a situation – one's sense of which possibilities for action are available in that situation. Crucially, a moral disposition requires maintaining that interpretation into the future (GA25:378–79). The single charitable act that one has actually carried out (or the sum of charitable acts from the past) does not establish one's having a charitable disposition; rather, one only has such a disposition insofar as these possibilities continue to be available to oneself. Likewise, Heidegger argues that apperception is an ability or comportment where one takes up and maintains a particular interpretation of the objects around oneself, and the way one stands in relation to those objects. In particular, one interprets them in terms of now-time, taking the world to be populated by subsisting, causally interacting objects that stand opposite to

a knowing subject. Because apperception is the ability to project an understanding of the objects around oneself in light of time as a sequence of nows, it relies on an even more fundamental ability: the ability to take an interpretive stance, such that one projects that interpretation into the future. Otherwise put, apperception relies on original TEMPORALITY.

Heidegger suggests that the argument where Kant introduces apperception (the Transcendental Deduction) brings out the priority of the faculty of IMAGINATION over the faculty of understanding. The understanding – our conceptual faculty that organizes sensible information with concepts or rules – has traditionally been afforded priority in philosophy (including in neo-Kantian interpretations of Kant). Because apperception is required for us to apply concepts, Kant identifies apperception as a fundamental feature of the understanding. Through a detailed reconstruction of Kant's argument in the Transcendental Deduction, Heidegger argues that the imagination in fact refers to original temporality: the basic temporal structure of human existence whereby we project an understanding of the world into the future, on the basis of a past understanding, revealing the present. Though Kant is inconsistent about the relationship between the imagination and the other cognitive faculties, Heidegger claims that the imagination has priority because apperception is dependent upon original temporality (i.e., the imagination). Based on Heidegger's reading of the Transcendental Deduction, "the understanding loses its priority and by this very loss manifests its essence, which consists in having to be grounded in the pure synthesis of the imagination, a synthesis which is bound to time" (GA3:89).

Because apperception relies upon the temporal structure of the imagination, Heidegger criticizes Kant's claim that a positive account cannot be given of the ego beyond its function of unifying representations with an "I think." Kant, for example, maintains that we cannot establish that our unified perspective is linked to an immortal substance; as the structure of our judgment, rather than an object given to sensibility, concepts (like substance) do not apply to the apperceptive ego. While Heidegger agrees that the self should not be understood in the same way as the objects it encounters, he does think that a positive account can be developed: "[Kant] has not shown that the 'I act' itself cannot be interpreted in the way in which it gives itself, in this self-manifesting ontological constitution. Perhaps it is precisely time which is the *a priori* of the ego – time, to be sure, in a more original sense than Kant was able to conceive it" (GA24:206–07). The positive, substantive account of the ego to which Heidegger gestures in this passage invokes his own account of DASEIN in *Being and Time*, where Dasein has a temporal structure dubbed "CARE."

Morganna Lambeth

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Apperception and theory GA1:66, 68, 81, 129, 142, 145, 162; SZ 319; GA3:79–84, 116, 122, 127, 135–36, 154, 156, 173, 184, 253; GA9:460–64/348–51; GA15:308/FS 23; GA21:322–33; GA24:179–85, 205; GA25:316, 358, 366–80, 387–90, 393–95, 397–98, 406–13, 418–24; GA31:254–57; GA41:160–61
Apperception and morality GA24:179–85; GA25:375–76; GA31:254–57
Neo-Kantian apperception GA3:306; GA24:183; GA31:256

FURTHER READING

Carr 2007, Käufer 2013, Okrent 2007

APPROPRIATION (*EREIGNIS*). SEE ADAPTATION.

ARISE (*ENTSPRINGEN*). SEE LEAP.

ARISING (*AUFGEHEN*). SEE EMERGENCE.

ARRANGEMENT (*FÜGUNG*). SEE FITTINGNESS.

13.
ART (*KUNST*)

Aᴿᴛ ɪs ᴛʜᴇ historical happening of truth in which entities are unconcealed to us by means of a work of art. According to Heidegger, in order to understand art, we cannot take our cue from the aesthetic tradition; rather, we must analyze art in terms of its relation to ᴛʀᴜᴛʜ and ᴏɴᴛᴏʟᴏɢʏ. On his view, it is only within this framework that one can hope to give a proper account of three important aspects of art, viz., its ᴇssᴇɴᴄᴇ, creation, and appreciation.

In addition to defending a positive account of art, Heidegger devotes much of his discussion on this topic to a critique of aesthetics. As Heidegger presents it, aesthetics is driven by the idea that subjective ʟɪᴠᴇᴅ ᴇxᴘᴇʀɪᴇɴᴄᴇ is the key to understanding what the essence, appreciation, and creation of a work of art involves:

> The way in which man experiences art is supposed to inform us about its essential nature. Experience is the standard-giving source not only for the appreciation and enjoyment of art but also for its creation. Everything is experience. (GA5:67/50)

Teasing this claim out, he suggests that aesthetics takes the essence of a work of art to depend on it being an ᴏʙᴊᴇᴄᴛ of subjective experience: "Aesthetics treated the artwork as an object, as indeed an object of *aesthesis*, of sensory apprehension … [which] these days … is called an 'experience'" (GA5:67/50). Meanwhile, he maintains that aesthetics analyzes the appreciation of a work of art in terms of the feelings and experiences the object gives rise to in a subject, e.g., the feeling of pleasure, which defines beautiful art in the classic eighteenth-century aesthetic tradition. Finally, concerning the creation of a work of art, Heidegger claims that aesthetics takes it to involve something akin to handicraft, i.e., the skilled activity through which a craftsperson takes some matter and gives it form in light of an end or purpose. Indeed, he argues that this conception of artistic creativity becomes so influential that "the conceptual pair 'matter and form' came to be the really principal schema for all inquiry into art" (GA43:99/N1 82; see also GA5:12/9).

Heidegger raises several objections to this aesthetic approach to art. To begin, he argues that aesthetics is misguided in applying the form–matter distinction to art because this distinction is not one that "belongs, originally, to the sphere of art and the artwork," but rather to the sphere of ᴇǫᴜɪᴘᴍᴇɴᴛ (GA5:12/9). Unlike equipment, which depends on our ends and purposes, he asserts that there is something about a work of art that is "self-sufficient … which has taken shape by itself and is never forced into being" and in this regard is more like another type of being, viz., a mere thing (GA5:14/10).

Moreover, Heidegger argues that any analysis of a work of art solely in terms of its relation to subjective experience is problematic because it feeds into two worrisome tendencies that dominate the modern era, viz., subjectivism and the drive to set everything into an ɪɴᴠᴇɴᴛᴏʀʏ or sʏɴ-ᴛʜᴇᴛɪᴄ ᴄᴏᴍ-ᴘᴏsɪᴛ(ɪᴏɴ)ɪɴɢ (*Ge-Stell*). Subjectivism, for Heidegger, involves the disposition to carve up the world into sᴜʙᴊᴇᴄᴛs and ᴏʙᴊᴇᴄᴛs and to take the former to be

the measure of the latter. Meanwhile, the inventory is the more extreme form subjectivism takes in the technological era in which entities come to be defined not just in relation to the subject, but to the subject's will (see Technology). Accordingly, in the inventory all entities come to be regarded as resources or STANDING RESERVE, the value of which we can calculate in relation to our will.

According to Heidegger, aesthetics falls under the sway of both of these tendencies. In the first place, its commitment to subjectivism is evident in the fact that it places art within the framework of subjects and objects. In aesthetics,

> the artwork is posited as the "object" for a "subject"; definitive for aesthetic consideration is the subject-object relation. . . . The work becomes an object in terms of that surface which is accessible to "lived experience." (GA43:91/N1 78)

Furthermore, he indicates that the influence of technology and the inventory is manifest in the rise of the "art business" (*Kunstbetriebes*) and the fact that works of art come to be defined in relation to that business, e.g., as objects to be enjoyed by the connoisseur, preserved by the curator, criticized by the critic, etc. (GA5:26/19).

Heidegger raises a number of objections against aesthetics on the basis of the tendencies in it toward subjectivism and the inventory. To begin, aesthetics falls prey to Heidegger's more general objection to these tendencies, viz., that they encourage an overly anthropocentric understanding of entities. Rather than understanding entities on their own terms, according to their own essences, he objects that subjectivism and the inventory erroneously lead us to define entities solely in terms of their relation to human beings. For Heidegger, then, aesthetics goes wrong insofar as it overlooks the ways in which works of art manifest something that is not entirely of human making.

Furthermore, he objects that by treating a work of art as an object of subjective experience or as a resource, aesthetics overlooks the true value of a work of art. "For us today," he says, "the beautiful is the relaxing, what is restful, and thus intended for enjoyment. Art then belongs in the domain of the pastry chef" (GA40:140/146). However, on Heidegger's view, this misestimates the value of what a work of art as "great art" could be:

> Great art and its works are great in their historical emergence and being because in man's historical existence they accomplish a decisive task: they make manifest, in the way appropriate to works, what entities as a whole are. . . . Art and its works are necessary only as an itinerary and sojourn for man in which the truth of entities as a whole . . . opens itself up to him. . . . [A]rt is great because it is an "absolute need." (GA43:100/84)

As this passage indicates, he thinks great art accomplishes a decisive task in history because it answers an absolute need, viz., to understand the truth of entities as a whole. However, echoing Hegel's claims about the end of art, Heidegger maintains that although there used to be great art, e.g., in Greece, "when aesthetics achieves its greatest possible height, breadth, and rigor of form, great art comes to an end" (GA43:100/N1 84; see also GA5:67–70/50–52). By Heidegger's lights, by approaching art from within the perspectives of subjectivism and the inventory, aesthetics mistakenly limits the potential of a work of art to the realm of pastry when it, in fact, once did and perhaps could once again play a decisive historical role in our understanding of the truth of entities.

On this point, Heidegger does not appear to share Hegel's conviction that great art must remain a thing of the past. Rather, he leaves open the possibility that art might one day again be great; indeed, he even indicates that art might be what saves us from the grip of technology:

> Could it be that [poetic] revealing lays claim to the arts most primally, so that they for their part may expressly foster the growth of the saving power . . .? Whether art may be granted this highest possibility of its essence in the midst of the extreme danger, no one can tell. (GA7:36/QCT 35)

At the very least, he acknowledges that art has a possibility higher than that which aesthetics accords it and leaves it open whether it can once again play a decisive role in history, revealing to us the truth of entities as they are in their own essence.

Contrary to the aesthetic tradition, Heidegger thus thinks that a proper analysis of the essence, creation, and appreciation of art is one that relies neither on the framework of subjects and objects, nor on the perspective of technology as the INVENTORY, and that, instead, restores the possibility that art can be great insofar as it historically reveals to us the truth of entities. Defending such an account is something that Heidegger undertakes with his first major essay on art, 'The Origin of the Work of Art' (1935–36) and that he refines over the years, especially in his lectures and writing on POETRY, e.g., his lectures on Hölderlin's "Germania" and "The Rhine" (GA39, 1934–35), *Elucidations of Hölderlin's Poetry* (GA4, 1936–68), "Why Poets?" (1946), and ". . . Poetically Man Dwells . . ." (1951).[1]

In order to develop the details of Heidegger's account, it makes sense to start, as he does in the "Origin" essay, with a discussion of the essence of art. Heidegger begins this essay by drawing a distinction between a *work of art* and *art*. Whereas a work of art is a particular type of being that we can come across in experience, e.g., a painting, he claims that art is what serves as the "origin" of a work of art, i.e., the "source of its essence [*Wesen*]" (GA5:1/1). He, in turn, defines art as "a happening of truth," which involves "the setting-itself-to-work of the truth of entities" ("*das Sich-ins-Werk-Setzen der Wahrheit des Seienden*," GA5:21/16). By "truth" in this context, Heidegger has in mind the Greek conception of truth as ALÊTHEIA, which involves the "unconcealment of entities"; in which case, when truth happens in art, he thinks the truth of entities is unconcealed (GA5:21/16). However, as the definition of art indicates, this unconcealment is something that occurs when truth sets itself "*ins-Werk*," i.e., it both actively sets itself to work and sets itself up in a work of art. Accordingly, he defines a work of art as a being in which truth happens, as entities are unconcealed to us.

In order to illustrate this definition of a work of art, in the "Origin" essay Heidegger uses several examples, the two most famous of which are a painting of peasant shoes by van Gogh and a Greek temple at Paestum.[2] In the case of the van Gogh shoes, Heidegger claims that the painting involves a happening of truth because it discloses to us what pertains to the essence of the shoes insofar as they are equipment, viz., "reliability" (GA5:19/14).[3] Meanwhile with

---

[1] For a discussion of Heidegger's later reflections on non-poetic arts, including the abstract painting of Klee and Cézanne and East Asian art, see Young 2001, chap. 4. See also Sharr 2007 for a discussion of Heidegger and architecture, and Torsen 2014 for a discussion of Heidegger and abstract art.

[2] Another important example that he mentions, but develops to a lesser extent, is C.F. Meyer's poem "The Roman Fountain." For criticism of Heidegger's use of examples in art merely as a means to explore his own philosophical ideas about truth and being, see Pöggeler 1994b.

[3] Heidegger's analysis of the van Gogh painting was sharply criticized by the art historian Meyer Schapiro (1968 and 1994) for amalgamating several of van Gogh's paintings of shoes and for identifying the shoes as peasant shoes, when

regards to the temple, Heidegger suggests that truth happens in it insofar as it "opens up a world while, at the same time, setting this world back onto the earth" (GA5:28/21). "World" and "earth" are technical terms for Heidegger and since they play a pivotal role in his analysis of how truth happens not just in the temple, but in any work of art, they warrant closer analysis.[4]

In the "Origin" essay, he characterizes a world as "the world of [a] historical people," e.g., the world of ancient Greece or the Middle Ages, and he claims that it is shaped by the complex web of relations that gives meaning to everything in that world (GA5:28/21). For example, he suggests that the world of ancient Greece is determined by the "paths and relations in which birth and death, disaster and blessing, victory and disgrace, endurance and decline acquire for the human being the shape of its destiny" (GA5:28/21). By contrast, he describes the earth as something that arises out of itself, independently from us. Indeed, he suggests it is "self-closing" and "self-secluding," something that shuts itself off from human attempts to understand it (GA5:35/26, 34/25). Nevertheless, he also maintains that the earth serves as the secure basis out of which everything else arises; hence, the earth serves as that in which everything, including a historical human world, is grounded.

Heidegger, in turn, connects the idea of world and earth to a work of art, claiming that it is of the essence of a work of art to (1) set up a world, and (2) set forth the earth. On his view, a work sets up a world when it "opens up a *world* and keeps it abidingly in force" (GA5:30/22).[5] That is to say, the work is something that discloses and illuminates a particular historical world, e.g., van Gogh's painting opens up the world of the peasant woman to us. Meanwhile, he claims that a work sets forth the earth because it allows it to emerge as what it is, i.e., as something self-secluding, self-closing, and not of human making. Whether we consider the earthly materials a work of art is made of, e.g., "stone, wood, metal, color, language, tone," or the earthly setting in which a work is situated, e.g., the Greek temple standing on a rocky hillside, Heidegger claims that works of art make the earth visible to us (GA5:31/23).

Although a work thus brings world and earth into relationship with one another, Heidegger argues that this relationship is one that involves conflict and strife. This is due to the fact that world and earth, on his view, are "essentially different":

> The world is the self-opening openness of the broad paths of simple and essential decisions in the destiny of a historical people. The earth is the unforced coming forth of the continually self-closing. (GA5:35/26)

Insofar as the world demands openness and the earth demands concealment, when they come together in a work of art, Heidegger argues that they will be in conflict with one another. Yet in spite of this conflict, he maintains that the 'rift' (*Riß*) between the two should not be

---

they are, in fact, van Gogh's own shoes. For responses to this criticism, see Derrida (1987), who objects to both Heidegger's anti-modern privileging of the rural and Schapiro's privileging of the individual; and Thomson (2011a), who defends Heidegger's use of the painting on phenomenological grounds.

[4] There is a debate about the relative value of each of these examples for Heidegger: while Dreyfus (2005b) and Young (2001) argue that the Greek temple is the most important example, Thomson (2011a) claims van Gogh's painting is the most important.

[5] There is a question as to whether Heidegger's claim that a work sets up a world should be understood in an ontological sense, i.e., it founds a world, and/or in an epistemological sense, i.e., it reveals a world to us. See Dreyfus 2006, Young 2001, 29–34, and Richardson 2012, 294–98.

understood as a "cleft" between them, but rather as a "design" that binds the two together and which is, in turn, fixed in place in the "figure" (*Gestalt*) of the work of art (GA5:51/38).

For Heidegger, then, a work of art is something that sets up a world and sets forth the earth and in so doing makes manifest in its figure the strife and rift between the two. On Heidegger's account, recognizing these features of a work of art is crucial for understanding how truth happens in it. For he claims that,

> truth establishes itself in the work. Truth is present only as the strife between clearing and concealing in the opposition between world and earth. As this strife of world and earth, truth wills its establishment in the work. (GA5:50/37)

Heidegger's reasoning is as follows. Although truth is something that involves the unconcealment of entities, unconcealment is something that requires concealment. Entities do not just immediately disclose themselves to us; rather, they are initially concealed from us because they either "refuse" or "obstruct" themselves from us, and in order for truth, i.e., unconcealment to happen, there must be a "CLEARING" or "opening" among what is concealed, which illuminates those entities (GA5:40–41/30). For this reason, Heidegger asserts, "truth happens as the ur-strife between clearing and concealment" (GA5:42/32). However, given that he connects earth to what is concealing and closing and world to what opens and clears, he takes the tension between concealment and unconcealment to involve the strife between earth and world. Thus, in order for truth to happen, the world and earth must be brought into strife with one another, which is precisely what takes place in a work of art. The Greek temple, for example, can disclose the nature of the Greek world and the earth upon which it rests because it brings them out of unconcealment and makes their strife manifest.

There is, however, one further aspect of Heidegger's account of the essence of art in the "Origin" essay, which sets the scene for much of his later thought about this topic, viz., the claim that "*all art, as the letting happen of the advent of the truth of entities, is, in essence, poetry [Dichtung]*" (GA5:60/44). In order to clarify this idea, Heidegger draws a distinction between a narrow and broad sense of poetry: poetry in a narrow sense refers to the particular kind of linguistic work referred to as "poesy," whereas poetry in the broad sense refers to the "illuminating projection of truth" (GA5:60/45). Although Heidegger is aware that the latter is an unusual way to gloss what poetry is, he argues that it makes sense as long as we have "the right concept of language" (GA5:61/45). Though we tend to think of LANGUAGE as a means of communication, he insists that there is a more primordial sense of what language is as something that "brings entities as entities, for the first time into the open"; hence, he claims that language involves a kind of "projective saying" (GA5:61/46). On his view, poetry in a broad sense just is this type of projective saying that brings entities into unconcealment. So when Heidegger claims that art is poetry, he means art is poetry in the broad sense, i.e., it is something that involves projecting the strife between world and earth in such a way that allows entities to be unconcealed, hence truth to happen.

What thus emerges in the "Origin" essay is Heidegger's view that it is of the essence of art to be something that involves the happening of truth, i.e., poetry in the broad sense, and it is of the essence of a work of art to be a being in which truth happens.

Turning to Heidegger's account of the creation of a work of art, in the "Origin" essay he argues that instead of analyzing creation as aesthetics does in terms of the relationship between the artist and a work of art, we should instead take our cue from the essence of the work of art itself:

> Though the work first becomes an actual thing through the completion of creative activity and is, therefore, dependent on such activity for its reality, the essence of creation is determined by the essence of the work. (GA5:47/35)

Given that a work of art is essentially a being in which truth happens, he claims that, "we can characterize creation as the allowing of something to come forth in what has been brought forth" (GA5:48/35–36). The createdness of a work of art, thus, depends on the way in which it allows for truth to happen in it.

Although his analysis of the creation of a work of art in the "Origin" essay accordingly keeps some distance from an analysis of artistic activity, this is a topic that he devotes more attention to in his writings on poetry, emphasizing the idea that the creation of a poem involves (1) receptivity, and (2) the creation of a "building" in which human beings can "dwell."[6]

While Heidegger discusses poets like Rilke and Trakl, there is no poet, indeed no artist, who looms larger in Heidegger's corpus than Hölderlin: in addition to lecturing and writing about Hölderlin's poetry, many of Heidegger's key philosophical ideas, like the FOURFOLD, the flight of the gods, REMEMBRANCE, the festival, etc., owe a debt to Hölderlin. When pressed to explain why Hölderlin occupies such an important place for him, Heidegger claims that what singles Hölderlin out is that he is "*the poet's poet*," i.e., a poet who uses his poetry to explore what the poetic vocation amounts to (GA4:34/52).

By Heidegger's lights, Hölderlin helps us see that contrary to the aesthetic view that analyzes artistic creativity in terms of the activity of the artist, poetic creativity is, in fact, a process in which the poet is initially receptive to entities and the work she produces is the means by which she gives what she has received. Making this point in "Why Poets?" he says,

> fashion means: create or retrieve [*Schaffen bedeutet schöpfen*]. To retrieve from a source means to take in what rises up and to bring away what has been received.... [It] manufactures nothing. It receives and gives what it has received. (GA5:298/224)

As he tends to make this point in his later philosophy, the poet should let herself be adapted (*vereignet*) by ADAPTATION [*Ereignis*]. At times, he identifies this adaptation as the summons of language that itself speaks and of the fourfold of earth, sky, divinities, and mortals. However, a significant strain in his thought indicates that poets can also be receptive to issues that pertain to the modern technological era. This is the topic of "Why Poets?," an essay that takes its cue from Hölderlin's question, "*and why poets in a desolate [dürftiger] time*?" (GA5:269/200).

Following Hölderlin, Heidegger suggests that what characterizes the modern "desolate time" is the "default of God": "a God no longer gathers men and things to himself visibly and unmistakably and from this gathering ordains world-history and man's stay within it" (GA5:270/200). Instead of having a God or gods to give things value, Heidegger claims that under the sway of technology, we take everything to be under the rule of the human will.

---

[6] Whether we can extend Heidegger's analysis of poetic creativity to artistic creativity more generally depends upon whether one lays emphasis on his claim that all art is essentially poetry or his claim that given its connection to language, poetry is a privileged form of art: "poesy happens in language because the latter preserves the primordial essence of poetry. Building and plastic creation, on the other hand, happen, always and only, in the open of saying and naming" (GA5:62/46). If one emphasizes the former, then it seems viable to apply the model of creation in poetry to other art forms; but if one emphasizes the latter, then it would seem creation in poetry is distinct from what occurs in other art forms.

Though we are desolate, Heidegger indicates that most of us are no longer able even to experience this: we tend to be so enveloped in technology that we no longer recognize that there is something lacking in the modern world. By contrast, he argues that some modern poets are sensitive to the "ABYSS" of the modern era, as well as to the "track of the fugitive gods" (GA5:270/200, 272/202). For this reason, he says that "to be a poet in a desolate time means: singing, to attend to the track of the fugitive gods" (GA5:272/202). By being responsive to and then singing about the fugitive gods, Heidegger thinks that poets can illuminate the DANGER of living in the era of technology.

In addition to receptivity being an important component of poetic creativity, Heidegger argues that the poet creates a space, a "building," in which she allows entities to exist in accordance with their own essence. This is an idea that emerges in his discussion of the concepts BUILDING and DWELLING in his essays "Building Dwelling Thinking" (1951) and "... Poetically Man Dwells ... " Clos Heidegger draws the idea of dwelling from Hölderlin's line "poetically man dwells upon the earth," and he claims that dwelling constitutes the "basic character of human existence" and the "manner in which mortals are on the earth" (GA7:191, 193, 150/PLT 211, 213, 146). More specifically, he says that dwelling involves "*schonen*," which is translated as "to spare" and "to preserve" (GA7:151/PLT 147). His idea is that dwelling is something that "leaves" things to exist in their own nature, indeed "safeguards" and "protects" them from any tendency to dominate them (GA7:151/PLT 147). He identifies these things as the fourfold and asserts that dwelling involves the way in which we, as mortals, "preserve [*schonen*] the fourfold in its essential being" (GA7:152/PLT 148). That is to say, unlike in technology when human beings assert their command over everything, in dwelling human beings allow earth, sky, divinities, and mortals to be as they are.

Though dwelling is the basic character of human existence, Heidegger maintains that "poetry is what really lets us dwell" because it provides us with a "building" in which we can dwell (GA7:193/PLT 213). By "building" in this context he does not mean a physical structure like a house, but rather a "PLACE" that both "*admits* the fourfold and ... *installs* the fourfold" (GA7:156/PLT 155). It is in this building that, he thinks, human beings can dwell because it is a space that encourages us to let entities exist in accordance with their own essence.

In sum, Heidegger views the creation of a work of art as something that involves allowing truth to happen and the poet's (and perhaps other artist's) contribution to this depends on her responsiveness to entities and her ability to give what she has received in the "building" that is her poetry.

The final area to discuss is Heidegger's view of the appreciation of a work of art. According to Heidegger, there are two key characteristics of our appreciation of a work of art: preservation and displacement. Although we tend to associate preservation with what a curator does, Heidegger conceives of preservation as something that involves "allowing the work to be a work," i.e., allowing the work to disclose entities to us in accordance with their own essence (GA5:54/40). He claims that this sort of preservation requires a distinctive kind of willing and knowing:

> Willing [in this context] is the sober RESOLUTENESS [*Ent-schlossenheit*] of that existential self-transcendence which exposes itself to the openness of entities as it is set into the work. . . . As knowing, preservation of the work is the sober standing-within the awesomeness of the truth that happens in the work. (GA5:55/41)

Thus, in order to preserve a work of art, we must both will to remain open to entities that transcend us and engage in the kind of knowing that involves standing within the truth that happens.

Moreover, when we preserve or dwell in a work in this way, Heidegger claims that the work will have a powerful effect on us, displacing us from our ordinary way of looking at things and disclosing things to us in a new light:

> [the work will] carry us into the openness [of entities] and, at the same time, out of the realm of the usual. To submit to this displacement means: to transform all familiar relations to world and to earth, and henceforth to restrain all usual doing and prizing, knowing and looking, in order to dwell within the truth that is happening in the work. (GA5:54/40)

Far from our response to art, then, being a matter of aesthetic experience of pleasure, Heidegger suggests that when we are appropriately responsive to a work of art, we break away from what is familiar and come to dwell in the "extraordinary," i.e., in the way in which truth happens in a work of art (GA5:54/40). This, in turn, is something Heidegger thinks can be of decisive historical significance, as it answers our absolute need to understand the truth of entities.

Samantha Matherne

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA5:1–74/1–56, 75/57, 269–320/200–41; GA7:35–36, 39/QCT 34–35, 156; GA7:145–64, 191–208/PLT 141–160, 209–27; GA12:33–78, 81–146/OWL 159–98, 1–54; GA39; GA40:140/136; GA43/N1; GA52; GA53; GA75

FURTHER READING

Derrida 1987, Dreyfus 2005b, Harries 2009, Pippin 2013b, Pöggeler 1972, Pöggeler 1994a, Pöggeler 1994b, Richardson 2012, Schapiro 1994a, Schapiro 1994b, Sharr 2007, Thomson 2011a, Torsen 2014, Young 2001

ARTICULATE (*GLIEDERN, ARTIKULIERE*N). SEE JOINTEDNESS.

ARTICULATE STRUCTURE (*GLIEDERUNG*). SEE JOINTEDNESS.

ARTICULATION (*GLIEDERUNG*). SEE JOINTEDNESS.

14.
ARTICULATION (*ARTIKULATION*)

Articulation is the process by which an overall background awareness or disclosure of the world takes on determinate structure, culminating in the individuation of particular entities or features of the world and distinct meanings.

Articulation (*Artikulation*) is one of several terms Heidegger uses in *Being and Time* to describe features of the transformation of indeterminate background meaning or SENSE (*Sinn*) into distinct or delimited MEANINGS (*Bedeutungen*) capable of being marked by an expression. It features most prominently in Heidegger's definition of DISCOURSE (*Rede*) in §34 as the "articulation" of "intelligibility," that is, of what(ever) can be understood (SZ 161).

The term "articulation" (*Artikulation*) and cognates are closely connected with the notion of "JOINTEDNESS" (*Gliederung*) in both standard German and Heidegger's own more technical use. However, in defining discourse Heidegger uses these two terms to make a significant distinction: "intelligibility is also always-already jointed [*gegliedert*] before appropriating INTERPRETATION. Discourse is the articulation of intelligibility" (SZ 161). In other words, everything that can be understood has a kind of structure, its jointedness, that is prior to interpretation and is the result of articulation (by discourse). At first glance this passage might be read as suggesting that jointedness and articulation both occur *only* prior to interpretation. This reading assumes that Heidegger's terms "articulation" and "jointedness" are correlative or synonymous, an assumption supported by Heidegger's talk of "that which is jointed in discursive articulation" ("das in der redenden Artikulation Gegliederte," SZ 161) and by the fact that he often uses the two terms interchangeably (see JOINTEDNESS). Nevertheless, there are some subtle differences between Heidegger's use of the two terms that challenge this assumption and require a more careful reading of the above passage.

One such difference is that Heidegger uses the term "articulation" and cognates in a more theoretical register than the term "jointedness." For example, while he talks of DASEIN's understanding as "conceptually articulated" (*begrifflich artikuliert*, SZ 3; see also SZ 54, 168, 369), he avoids expressions like "conceptually jointed" (*begrifflich gegliedert*). Similarly, he talks of "articulation," but not "jointedness," in relation to "predicating" acts (SZ 155) and the "thematization" linked with a "scientific projection" (SZ 363). Conversely, he claims that the "basic forms of a possible jointedness in terms of meanings [*bedeutungsmäßige Gliederung*]" are not found in "theoretical contemplation" (SZ 165). This difference is an example of Heidegger's characteristic sensitivity to the difference between colloquial words with a German stem (such as *Gliederung*) and nearly synonymous Germanized "foreign" words (*Fremdwörter*, such as *Artikulation*) with a more intellectual or highbrow use. A second difference is that Heidegger often uses the verb "to articulate" (*artikulieren*) in his analyses (e.g., SZ 104, 111, 158, 165, 335) and only rarely uses the verb "to joint" (*gliedern*, SZ 271 and, as a substantivized verb, 161), suggesting that he uses the former when emphasizing the *process* of making disclosure more determinate. This suggestion is supported by a third difference, the fact that Heidegger often links his technical notion of interpretation (*Auslegung*) with articulation,

but only once with jointedness (SZ 153). Thus "articulating interpretation," or the "articulation of what is understood in the interpreting approach to that which is," involves the imposition of an "as-structure" or the identification of "something as something" (SZ 149; see also SZ 156, 158, 159, 409). This is important because it makes clear that articulation is not something (discourse) that takes place only prior to interpretation, challenging the initial interpretation of SZ 161 above.

These differences reflect the fact that although Heidegger's talk of articulation and jointedness is intimately connected and sometimes indistinguishable, there tends to be a slight difference in emphasis. So although he sometimes – especially prior to SZ (see GA20:310; GA21:299–300) – uses the term "articulate" to refer to a particular kind of structure with interconnected parts belonging to a whole, he more commonly talks of "jointedness" to highlight this kind of structure (see Jointedness). Conversely, although he occasionally uses the verb "to joint" (*gliedern*), Heidegger more commonly talks of "articulation" and cognates when referring to articulation as a process. The articulation of disclosure is thus a *process* that results in meaning or disclosure with a jointed *structure*, a structure in which each part makes sense only in the context of the whole to which it belongs.

Noticing this difference in emphasis allows a more careful reading of the passage that defines discourse, one in which both jointedness and articulation have a broader scope than one might initially suspect. Heidegger certainly claims there that prior to interpretation Dasein's understanding already has a jointed structure, a structure due to the articulation by what he calls discourse. This pre-interpretive structure can be understood as a pattern of differences, or a manifold, in which constituent parts are not yet picked out distinctly (with an as-structure). This might be compared with looking out at the sea on a stormy day, where we see a structured surface with many waves, without any of them being picked out individually. However, articulation is a broader term that encompasses not only discourse (SZ 161, 296, 416), but also interpretation. With the latter comes a new kind of order, another jointed structure, in which constituent parts or aspects of the disclosed world are picked out distinctly and can be linked with a meaning or marked by an expression (SZ 149). Thus, in the previous example, we might pick out particular waves, and refer to them in speech, without any implication that these are parts existing either independently of or prior to the whole.

It should also be noted that these two modes of articulation, and the corresponding patterns of jointed structure, are not identical: interpretation's as-structure does not simply read off or track the pre-interpretive structure due to discourse. Rather, the latter has a lower degree of determinacy that functions as a precondition for the distinctive ordering that the former introduces. While functioning as a constraint, the pre-interpretive structure due to discourse is thus "indifferent," allowing and grounding different modes of interpretation, and hence as-structure, such that one and the same entity can be interpreted as either an available hammer or as an occurrent physical object (GA24:396, 417; SZ 201).

The case of interpreting articulation highlights particularly clearly how and why Heidegger thinks of the resultant structure as jointed. For he conceives as-structure as an organization of subject-matter that involves not just the connection or synthesis of antecedently separate features, but both connection and separation, or taking together and distinguishing them (SZ 159). The picking out or individuation of entities, i.e., the formation of an as-structure in interpretation, is thus conceived in terms of an intrinsic connection between parts and

a background whole (from which these parts must be separated out) of the kind highlighted by Heidegger's use of the term jointedness. As Heidegger puts it, connection and separation are precisely what "joints the primordial unitary essence of a structure and of a structured phenomenon" (GA29/30:459).

Andrew Inkpin

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 149–51, 156, 159, 161, 363; GA21:299–300
Contrast with jointedness SZ 161
Link with discourse SZ 161, 296, 335, 349, 406, 408, 416
Link with interpretation SZ 149, 158, 159, 406, 408, 409
Link with predication SZ 155, 157, 158

FURTHER READING

Blattner 1999, 67–75, Carman 2003, 229–32, Dreyfus 1991, 208, 215–24, Wrathall 2011, 95–156, esp. 108–09, 131, Wrathall 2013a, 206–07, 214–19

15.
AS-STRUCTURE (*ALS-STRUKTUR*)

THE AS-STRUCTURE is a constitutive feature of every experience of entities in the world – namely, the way they always present themselves in terms of a "for something." According to Heidegger, the "as-structure" is a character of both INTERPRETATION and ASSERTION. He argues that it is only because all things are already discovered and articulated in what they *are for* – i.e., are already interpreted *as something* in our practical comportment – that we can formulate assertions about them. In making an assertion we no longer interpret something *as* something ("as" in the hermeneutical sense), that is, we do not deal with it in the totality of the situation. Rather, we determine something *as* simply OCCURRENT ("as" in the apophantical sense), thereby cutting it off from its context and discovering it in a theoretical attitude. The apophantical "as-structure" of assertion is founded on the hermeneutical as-structure of interpretation, and it is a derivative, privative modification of it.

The adjectives "hermeneutical" and "apophantical" are taken from the philosophical tradition. Specifically, the former comes from Schleiermacher's idea of hermeneutics as the praxis of text-interpretation. The latter comes from Aristotle's "*logos apophantikos*" which is a way of speaking of and at the same time of showing an entity (*Sehenlassen des Seienden*, GA21:163/137). Introducing the hermeneutical "as-structure" in *Being and Time* and in the lectures of this period, Heidegger points out that the assertion, which "has been accepted from ancient times as the primary and authentic 'locus' of *truth*" (SZ 154) is possible only because things are already manifest as what they are, interpreted as something in order to carry out a possibility in our practical concern. On the basis of a modification of our practical comportment, something that is simply occurrent shows up as "what" the statement is actually about, i.e. "the 'object' of an assertion" (SZ 157–58). Heidegger describes the genesis of the theoretical assertion phenomenologically as a decontextualization and devitalization of our interpretive practical comportments.

He elaborates completely the pivotal role of the hermeneutical "as-structure" in the 1925–26 lecture *Logic: The Question of Truth* (GA21) dealing with Aristotle's concept of truth. The hermeneutic "as-structure" involves our way of coping with things, our praxis, i.e., our being in the world in the sense of being familiar and confident with it. As Heidegger puts it in this lecture, for instance: "a chalkboard, if it were unintelligible, would, as such, not be present here. Unless it were understood as for-writing-on, it would be hidden. The same with a door unless it is understood as for-entering-and-exiting" (GA21:144/121). "That is, writing, entering-exiting, sitting, and the like are what we are *a priori* involved with. What we know and learn when we 'know our way around' are these uses-for-which we understand it. . . . Every act of having something before our eyes . . . is in and of itself a matter of 'having' something as something" (GA21:144/121).

That means: "In short, it has the *as-structure*" (GA21:144/121).

In *Being and Time* he points out that in the interpretation of these entities as "for writing," "entering and exiting," "sitting," "hammering," and so on, i.e., our *knowing how* to cope with things as well as the totality of their AFFORDANCES (*Bewandnisganzheit*), they get to be *explicitly*

understood, to be interpreted in the broad sense of being "laid out" (this is what the German verb meaning "to interpret," *Auslegen*, literally means):

> That which has been circumspectively taken apart with regard to its "in-order-to," and taken apart as such – that which is *expressly* understood – has the structure of *something as something*. . . . If we tell what it is for [*des Wozu*], we are not simply designating something; but that which is designated is understood *as* that *as* which we are to take the thing in question. That which is disclosed in understanding – that which is understood – is already accessible in such a way that its "as which" can be made to stand out expressly. The "as" makes up the structure of the expressness of something that is understood. It constitutes the interpretation. (SZ 149; see also EXPRESS)

When we enter a seminar room, for example, we "see" the seat, for sitting on, the table, for taking notes, the blackboard, for the professor to write on, and so forth. Heidegger does not mean that we perceive first the material thing "blackboard" and then we "interpret" or "use" it as something in order to write. "This would be a misunderstanding of the specific way in which interpretation functions as disclosure" (SZ 150). Rather he underlines that "any mere pre-predicative seeing of the AVAILABLE is, in itself, something which already understands and interprets" (SZ 149).

Against Husserl's phenomenological model of perception, he points out that every perception of something is already understanding and interpreting. This means: we do not "perceive" an isolated material thing, rather we encounter something available (for example, the blackboard as something to write on), on the background of the disclosure of the world, i.e., of a totality of affordances to which equipment belongs; in our example, this means the disclosure of the whole "seminar room situation." On the basis of the primary showing up of something as something in our praxis, we can point out an aspect of it, making a thematic statement about it: this interpreting something as something "lies *before* . . . our making any thematic assertion about it. In such an assertion the 'as' does not turn up for the first time; it just gets expressed for the first time, and this is possible only in that it lies before us as something expressible" (SZ 149). "Assertion is not a free-floating kind of behaviour which, in its own right, might be capable of disclosing entities in general in a primary way"(SZ 156).

When distinguishing the hermeneutical and the apophantical as-structure in *Being and Time*, as well as in his seminar of the same period, Heidegger is particularly interested in the genesis of the "theoretical assertion," which "logic" has already assumed as attribution of some properties to a subject. He shows how, for instance, a sentence like "the hammer is heavy" – which "logic" has already understood to have the meaning of "this thing – the hammer – has the property of heaviness" (SZ 157) – is in *different ways* a derivative phenomenon. To reach this goal, he refers the phenomenological analysis back to our praxis:

> in concernful circumspection there are no such assertions "at first." But such circumspection has of course its specific ways of interpreting, and these, as compared with the "theoretical judgment" just mentioned, may take some such form as "The hammer is too heavy," or rather just "Too heavy!", "Hand me the other hammer!" Interpretation is carried out primordially not in a theoretical statement but in an action of circumspective concern – laying aside the unsuitable tool, or exchanging it, "without wasting words." From the fact that words are absent, it may not be concluded that interpretation is absent. On the other hand, the kind of

interpretation which is circumspectively *expressed* is not necessarily already an assertion in the sense we have defined. (SZ 157)

Heidegger distinguishes between:

1. The hermeneutical "as-structure" involved in our practical comportments (i.e., using the hammer as hammer or exchanging it).
2. What could be referred to as the "hermeneutical" assertion, which spells out our inability to cope with the equipment in the situation and at the same time makes us see an aspect of the equipment: "Too heavy!" (SZ 155; for a similar example, see GA21:157/132).
3. The theoretical assertion "the hammer is heavy," which points out the heaviness as a determination of the hammer, discovered as something occurent. The apophantical as-structure "in the strict sense of the word" (SZ 155) is involved here.

Heidegger focuses on the two extreme opposite cases 1 and 3 (see SZ 158; GA21:156/131), analyzing how the hermeneutical as-structure of our practical comportment modifies itself into the apophantical as-structure of the theoretical assertion. The main question which he asks is the following: "*By what existential-ontological modifications does assertion arise from circumspective interpretation?*" (SZ 157):

> The entity which is held in our fore-having – for instance, the hammer – is proximally available as EQUIPMENT. If this entity becomes the "object" of an assertion, then as soon as we begin this assertion, there is already a change-over in the fore-having. Something *available with which* we have to do or perform something, turns into something "*about which*" the assertion that points out is made. Our fore-sight is aimed at something occurrent in what is available. (SZ 158)

This modification implies the discovering of something merely occurrent (*vorhanden*) – as what the assertion is about – veiling its primary showing up as something available (*zuhanden*), with which we perform an action. This means: we are no longer using the hammer for hammering, pointing out: "too heavy!" in the totality of the context, but we are determining the heaviness of the "hammer," intended no longer as a piece of equipment with which we cope or with which we can't cope well, but rather as a character of something simply present, which we have in front of us as something determinable. "Only now are we given any access to *properties* or the like" (SZ 158). This modification implies a decontextualization of the equipment from the totality of its affordances, on the background of which it can be encountered as such and to which it belongs. The hammer has been cut off from the totality of the referential context, which involves for instance that we are using the hammer, in order to drive a nail into the wall, in order to hang a picture, in order to decorate our home, for the sake of our living there:

> the as-structure of interpretation has undergone a modification. In its function of appropriating what is understood, the "as" no longer reaches out into a totality of involvements. As regards its possibilities for articulating reference-relations, it has been cut off from that significance which, as such, constitutes environmentality. (SZ 158)

The modification from the hermeneutical into the apophantical as-structure levels down the temporal structure of our BEING-IN-THE-WORLD to the unique dimension of the mere

presence: "the 'as' gets pushed back into the uniform plane of that which is merely occurrent" (SZ 158). "This levelling of the primordial 'as' of circumspective interpretation to the 'as' with which occurrentness is given a definite character is the specialty of assertion" (SZ 158).

By showing the modification of the hermeneutical as-structure into the apophantical one, Heidegger lays out the genesis of the theoretical assertion, deconstructing the primacy that the philosophical tradition accorded to this *logos* and pointing out its ontological ground:

> thus assertion cannot disown its ontological origin from an interpretation which understands. The primordial "as" of an interpretation (*ermeneia*) which understands circumspectively we call the "existential-*hermeneutical* 'as'" in distinction from the "*apophantical* 'as'" of the assertion. (SZ 158)

The Greek understanding of *logos apophantikos* does not recognize its foundation in the primordial hermeneutical as-structure (SZ 159). Nonetheless the meaning of the Aristotelic *logos apophantikos* is a phenomenological one, because it consists in a way of making things present as such. It is a way of discovering or uncovering, taking together (*synthesis*) and taking apart (*diairesis*) how entities are (SZ 159; GA21:135–42/136–43). This phenomenological sense does not match the interpretation of "judgment" as a correspondence between physical things and psychic "images" or mental representations. This phenomenological meaning gets lost and "Aristotle's phenomenological approach to the analysis of the *logos* collapses to a superficial 'theory of judgment,' in which judgment becomes the binding or separating of representations and concepts" (SZ 159). This separating and relating can be formalized even further, taking on the form of "calculus" (SZ 159), for example in formal logic or in computational science.

The hermeneutical and the apophantical "as" characterize our being in the world; animals lack the "as-structure" altogether (GA29/30:416, 483).

Lucilla Guidi

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

As-structure SZ 149, 151, 158, 359, 360; GA21:143–46, 148, 149, 152, 153, 155, 156, 158–61, 187, 207; GA22:126, 127
hermeneutical as SZ 159, 223; GA21:143, 150, 158, 160, 169, 187, 207, 364, 410
apophantical as SZ 158, 223; GA21:153, 160, 162, 168; GA29/30:446–50, 452

16.
ASSERTION (*AUSSAGE*)

FOR HEIDEGGER ASSERTION refers both to: (i) a speech act in which one endorses some particular claim for some communicative purpose (SZ 153–55); and (ii) the meaning or content which is so endorsed (GA29/30:437).

The concept of assertion plays a number of complex roles within Heidegger's thought: he suggests, for example, that it has provided the template for a historically dominant and pernicious ONTOLOGY (SZ 157; GA41:62–64, 33), and that it is itself a merely derivative form of MEANING or INTENTIONALITY (SZ 153; GA26:158). Yet he also refers to his own writings as assertions (GA24:461), and he is clear that one can make assertions about a wide range of entities, and not, for example, only about those which are OCCURRENT (SZ 224, 361). To understand Heidegger's stance on assertion, one needs first to note that his dual definition cuts across the standard distinction, found in both phenomenology and analytic philosophy of mind and language, between mode, quality, or attitude on the one hand and content on the other. When focusing on (i) – the content – Heidegger is equally happy to express his position in terms of a "judgment" (*Urteil*, SZ 153–54), or a "proposition" (*Satz*, GA20:344; GA9:130/102–03) or a "propositional assertion" (*Aussagesatz*, GA29/30:439–41). It is important to bear this dual meaning in mind since otherwise several of Heidegger's claims become trivial: for example, his remark that "in dealing with something, I do not make any thematic predicative assertions" (GA21:144) is trivial if read as acknowledging we can act without soliloquising, and highly controversial if read as claiming that there is no role for propositional content in action.

Two theses are at the core of Heidegger's treatment of assertions. The first, (1), is that assertion is linked to a particular and restrictive ontology. For example, SZ: 157–58 argues that there is a close connection between assertion and occurrentness, and later texts show a similar concern that assertion is unable to do justice to BEING (GA65:437). The second, (2), is that assertion is in some sense an explanatorily derivative form of meaning. For example, he states that:

> Assertions are first possible on the basis of an already latent comportment to entities ... making assertions is not at all a primordial relation to entities, but is itself possible on the basis of our already-being-among entities. (GA26:158; see similarly SZ 157; GA29/30:493)

In SZ he expresses this by contrasting the "apophantic as" with the more "primordial" "hermeneutic as" (SZ 159; see AS-STRUCTURE). But neither (1) nor (2) is straightforward. First, it is not clear why merely making an assertion about something should commit me to any particular ontology. The issue is complicated by radical ambiguities in "occurrentness," but the basic point is simple: if I say that "your taxi is outside," have I really rendered the taxi occurrent, as SZ 157–58 might appear to suggest? Furthermore, if the link between assertion and the occurrent were that direct, SZ itself would face a Tractarian-style self-reference problem: its discussion of Dasein would automatically misrepresent that entity. Second, we can only make sense of the

thesis that assertions are explanatorily derivative if we can get a good grip on the prior "already-being-among entities" on which they supposedly depend.

Very broadly speaking, there are two ways of reading this pair of claims about assertion. On the one hand, there is the "non-conceptualist strategy." Here one reads Heidegger as claiming that the primary level of Dasein's experience is non-conceptual. This delivers a ready-made explanation of (2): there is a level of meaning, typically thought of as both less determinate and richer than that characteristic of assertion or other propositional attitudes. (1) can then be explained in terms of (2): assertion reduces entities to occurrentness in the sense that it fails to capture the rich relations among them found at that primitive level. This type of approach is inspired by Dreyfus's hugely influential work and is exemplified in authors such as Carman and Wrathall.[1] One challenge faced by such an interpretation is to cash, both exegetically and philosophically, the appeal to the non-conceptual: this is typically done via notions such as the practical, the perceptual, or motor-intentionality. On the other hand, there is what one might call the "methodological" approach, defended by commentators such as Golob (see, for example, Golob 2013). On this view, (1) is read not as a claim about assertions per se, but rather about assertions when subject to a particular type of philosophical analysis. So, for example, Heidegger's target would include authors such as Aristotle, Leibniz, or Kant who attempted to derive substantive ontological conclusions from an analysis of subject-predicate form (GA41:33, 62–64; GA25:295), modern logicians whose focus on propositional analysis came at the price of neglecting the varied roles of assertion within Dasein's world (GA38:38/34–35; GA54:102), and analytic philosophers whose model of linguistic analysis generated pseudo-paradoxes such as the unity of the proposition (SZ 159; GA21:142). One immediate benefit of the strategy is the removal of any self-reference problem: Heidegger himself is free to use assertions as he likes provided only that he refrains from the pernicious theoretical analyses, now exposed as "a monstrous violation of what language accomplishes" (G36/37:104), and instead offers "a more radical understanding of language itself" based on assertion's various social roles (GA19:253). One challenge faced by this approach, however, is that a separate account of (2) is now required, one which does not appeal to non-conceptualism (see, for example, Golob 2014). Some story is also needed as to why Heidegger is worried that assertive practice will so easily degenerate into clichés (GA45:87; SZ 19, 36), and how that might be prevented: two key resources in developing such an explanation will be the notions of FORMAL INDICATION and IDLE TALK.

Sacha Golob

---

[1] For example, Carman 2003, 219, and Wrathall 2011, 19–20.

ASSERTION (*SATZ*). SEE PRINCIPLE.

ASSIGNMENT (*VERWEISUNG*). SEE REFERENCE.

ASSOCIATION (*UMGANG*). SEE COPING.

AT HAND, AT-HAND-NESS (*VORHANDEN, VORHANDENHEIT*). SEE OCCURRENT.

ATTACK (*ANGRIFF*). SEE CONCEPT.

ATTUNE (*STIMMEN*). SEE MOOD.

ATTUNED (*ABGESTIMMT*). SEE MOOD.

ATTUNEDNESS (*GESTIMMTHEIT*). SEE MOOD.

ATTUNEMENT (*STIMMUNG*). SEE MOOD.

17.
AUTHENTICITY (*EIGENTLICHKEIT*)

Early in being *and Time* Heidegger introduces a distinction between two modes of being (*Seinsmodi*) of Dasein, which he terms "authenticity" (*Eigentlichkeit*) and "inauthenticity" (*Uneigentlichkeit*). You exist in the mode of *authenticity* if you have "chosen, or achieved yourself in your being," and you exist in the mode of *inauthenticity* if you have "lost or only seemingly achieved yourself" (SZ 42). In the course of Heidegger's argument these notions take on an increasingly complex role in teasing out the basic concepts of human existence. They become central terms of Heidegger's existentialism and resonate with views of Heidegger's existentialist precursors. As a general definition one can say that Dasein exists *authentically* (*eigentlich*) if it exists in such a way as to express its own ontological make-up, including the vulnerability of its basic commitments. It exists *inauthentically* (*uneigentlich*) if it exists in such a way as to cover up its own ontological make-up; this includes fleeing from its mortality and failing to take responsibility for its commitments.

The German word *eigentlich* has two distinct meanings. First, the term has a substantial philosophical sense. *Eigen* means one's "own" and existence is *eigentlich* if it is owned or has taken hold of itself. This sense reflects the philosophical tradition of Rousseau and Kant that seeks internal sources for norms of thought and action, as opposed to conformity to external norms. For this sense, "authentic," deriving from the Greek roots *autos* and *hentes* for self-doing, is the usual translation. Heidegger also uses the term *eigenst* to name some of Dasein's most salient features; dying, for example, is Dasein's *eigenste* possibility. This is best rendered as "ownmost," keeping in mind that in German it has the same root as "authentic." Second, in ordinary language *eigentlich* means "actually," "intrinsically," or "really," lending emphasis to a claim. Heidegger suggests that an authentic existence that has taken hold of itself (in the substantial sense) is really existence (in the ordinary, emphatic sense), i.e., that self-owning best expresses the structures that belong to the essence of existence.

Inauthenticity is phenomenologically more prominent than authenticity. For the most part the phenomenology of everyday Dasein that takes up most of Division 1 of *Being and Time* spells out an inauthentic way of existing. Everyday existence is dominated by norms instituted and propagated by the anyone. Its self-understanding falls into the public understanding of everyday possibilities. The salience and centrality of the anyone, publicness, falling, and everydayness here are hallmarks of inauthenticity. These are the structures that Heidegger encounters and uncovers first and foremost in his phenomenology. One reason for this prominence may be that it is in fact the most common mode of existing; most people, most of the time let the public norms guide them. Another reason is structural. Heidegger writes that "authentic being-yourself does not rest on an exceptional condition of the subject in which it is detached from the anyone; it is rather an existentiell modification of the anyone as an essential existential" (SZ 130). So we can become authentic subsequent to already being immersed in the anyone. In this vein, Heidegger writes that in order to become authentic, we first have to do something, or some experience has to overcome us. We must "take ourselves back from the

anyone" (SZ 268), which we do by "hearing the call of CONSCIENCE" and "choosing ourselves" (SZ 287). Or we must experience ANXIETY, which "makes manifest our FREEDOM for choosing and grasping ourselves" and thus brings us before "the authenticity of our own being" (SZ 188). Authentic existing, thus, is a modification of the way we exist first and foremost, a modification that must be prompted by rare and difficult experiences.

At the same time, it is important to distinguish inauthentic Dasein from an existence that is not differentiated between authenticity and inauthenticity. Heidegger insists that "authentic existence is not something that hovers above falling everydayness, but existentially only a modified way of seizing this" (SZ 179). Authentic Dasein, too, exists in an everyday understanding, subject to public norms. Like all Dasein, if you are authentic, you find yourself at grips with equipment whose meaning and possibilities are established by public practices. Absorption is a general, structural feature of existence, both inauthentic and authentic. However, in falling into the world and into this public understanding we can also get *lost* in it: "Absorption . . . usually has the character of being lost in the publicness of the anyone. First and foremost Dasein has always already fallen into the 'world' and away from itself as authentic ABILITY-TO-BE-a-self" (SZ 175). This lostness characterizes inauthentic Dasein.

Authenticity has an important methodological function in Heidegger's overall argument in *Being and Time*. The goal of the book is to produce an explicit articulation of the basic concepts that make up human existence. In Division 1, Heidegger establishes the phenomenology of everydayness. Here he establishes the existentiality of the investigation and substantiates his claim that "a person is not a thing, nor a substance, nor an object" (SZ 47). Instead, a person is purposive, attuned, discursive ability at grips with the world's solicitations. While Heidegger mentions the distinction between inauthentic and authentic existence early on and spells out tendencies toward inauthenticity that emerge from the anyone and from falling, this distinction does little conceptual work until Division Two. Heidegger begins Division Two with a methodological reflection that calls the results of the existential analytic into question. He claims that the existential analytic does not interpret the whole of existence and does not sufficiently articulate its unity. In order to move beyond the "apparent impossibility of an ontological grasp and determination of the whole of Dasein" (SZ 235), Heidegger supplements the analyses of Division 1 with a phenomenology of authentic existence. Authenticity, he claims, provides the "phenomenal ground for the question about the existential CONSTITUTION [*Verfassung*] of Dasein" (SZ 267). Heidegger works out this phenomenology in the chapters on DEATH and GUILT at the beginning of Division Two. Existential death and existential guilt show how everyday being-amidst entities arises and can collapse. In Heidegger's suggestive phrase, it takes Dasein's everydayness, which is always "between birth and death" (SZ 233) and adds its beginning and end. An existence that expresses its own existential guilt and death displays Dasein as a WHOLE. Heidegger concludes that authenticity resolves the earlier methodological worries. "Dasein is thematized in an originary way, i.e. with respect to its authentic ability-to-be-whole . . . [and] this preliminary grasp of the existentiality of Dasein is sufficiently articulated to guide the conceptual elaboration of the existentialia" (SZ 311).

Before we turn to the central features of authenticity, it is helpful to explain why inauthenticity does not suitably reveal the ontology of the self. As we mentioned above, Dasein is inauthentic insofar as its everyday existence is lost in the publicness of the anyone. Heidegger says that "it is the make-up of being-in-the-world itself in its everyday way of being that misses itself and covers itself up" (SZ 130). The mistake of inauthentic self-construal is that it covers up

its own existentiality, because the publicly circulating understanding of the anyone is invulnerable and impersonal. It is invulnerable because from within the perspective of the anyone its norms and standards are firm and cannot collapse. It is impersonal because the anyone does not differentiate between individuals. "With Dasein's lostness into the anyone, its nearest factical abilities-to-be – the tasks, rules, measures, urgency and range of concernful, solicitous being-in-the-world – have always already been decided. The anyone has already relieved Dasein from taking up these possibilities of being" (SZ 268). Heidegger puts this impersonality of our everyday immersion into public norms in stark terms by claiming that Dasein is not its own self. Rather, the self of everyday existence is the anyone-self. Each inauthentic Dasein, so long as it is lost, is "dispersed into the anyone, and still has to find itself" (SZ 129). An inauthentic Dasein who, for example, takes herself to be a teacher, goes about this self-construal in terms of a public understanding of what it means for anyone to be a teacher and without an underlying readiness to make fundamental adjustments in case this understanding should fail. Such Dasein covers up the basic fact that the meaningful, purposive structure of the world depends on a self-chosen personal commitment to the values that institute the structure in the first place. To construe yourself as a teacher really (*eigentlich*) means that you have to choose and sustain such a commitment buttressed by nothing other than that choice itself.

Heidegger also claims that the self-construal of inauthentic Dasein has given rise to mistaken philosophical theories of the self. Since the meaning of entities and possibilities in the anyone looks stable from the perspective of inauthentic Dasein, such a person identifies herself as similarly stable and independent of her commitment to a purpose. Such self-identification determines the way in which the anyone-self refers to itself: "In this 'I' a self expresses itself that, first and foremost, I really am not. For the absorption in the everyday multifariousness and in chasing after concerns, the self shows itself as the self-forgotten concernful I, as something simple, constant and self-same, yet indeterminate and empty" (SZ 322). Inauthentic self-construal surfaces as a persistent, world-independent self-identifying entity. Philosophical theories render this in an "ontologically inadequate sense" as a subject. "For the ontological concept of the subject does not characterize the SELFHOOD of the I qua self, but the self-sameness and persistence of something that is always already OCCURRENT" (SZ 320). Heidegger thinks that Descartes' cogito and Kant's apperception are ontologically inadequate for this reason (SZ 204, 319ff.). Heidegger also claims that questions about personal identity over time are misguided because the framework for posing these questions derives from inauthentic self-construal.

> Driven about by its "business," Dasein must first gather itself out of the dispersion and disconnectedness of what has just "happened," if it wants to come to itself; and so the question about establishing the "connectedness" of Dasein in the sense of the "also" occurrent experiences of the subject only arises from the horizon of the understanding of inauthentic historicality. The possibility of the dominion of this horizon of questioning grounds in the irresoluteness that makes up the essence of the in-constancy of the self. (SZ 390)

Authenticity makes the basic existential features of Dasein phenomenologically accessible. It shows that the self cannot be separated from the world it engages in and that the meaningful structure of this world depends on Dasein's ability to make commitments and sustain them in the face of their possible collapse. It is instructive, here, to note that Heidegger says that the inauthentic anyone-self is "self-forgotten" (*selbstvergessen*, SZ 322). Dasein's existential features

are easy to miss, because they withdraw into the background and are usually hidden. A Dasein may exist as a teacher and sustain that commitment to her self-construal; as long as that fundamental commitment actively structures her world, it does so without obtruding. It functions by staying in the background. What shows itself, instead, are the EQUIPMENT and possibilities within the world of the teacher. An account of an authentic person who goes about her business in an everyday manner would simply replicate the undifferentiated description of Dasein's absorption in the everyday world of equipment. For this reason, Heidegger's phenomenology of authentic existence has to be a phenomenology of authenticity in the face of extreme circumstances, and he turns to death and guilt which, citing Jaspers, he calls "limit situations" (*Grenzsituationen*, SZ 249, 302, 308, 349).

The existential interpretation of death exhibits a fundamental vulnerability of the purposive structures that Dasein presses into. Anxiety reveals that whatever ends one exists toward can collapse and stop making sense, and one's abilities of responding to and dealing with the solicitations of equipment can lose their grip on the environment. Authentic Dasein deals with this "possibility of the impossibility of any particular comportment, any existing" (SZ 262) by taking up a stance that builds this vulnerability into its understanding of a situation. Heidegger's interpretation of existential guilt shows that the commitments that polarize the world are not fixed. There is nothing about one's background, culture, or biological make-up that can, by itself, create and maintain these commitments. They are chosen and sustained entirely in the act of carrying them out. Authentic Dasein embraces its possibilities guiltily, and therefore understands itself as fundamentally responsible for them. Such an embrace of death and guilt is hard to reconcile with ordinary experiences. Heidegger himself calls being toward death an "outlandish demand" (*phantastische Zumutung*, SZ 266). In his interpretation of guilt, however, he appeals to ordinary experiences of a conscience to show that authenticity is indeed a possible way of existing. We experience ordinary conscience as a call to take responsibility for a fault or lack that we brought about. Existential guilt similarly summons Dasein to take responsibility for its entire existence. If Dasein is properly attuned in anxiety and has the abilities to project its own existence, then it can heed this call.

Inauthentic Dasein remains estranged from its own possibilities. It does not know how to ground the purposive structure of possibilities; it always follows one that is prefigured by the anyone. Inauthentic disclosure therefore is not compatible with what anxiety unveils. It must escape anxiety and flee from death and guilt. Authentic Dasein "takes itself back from being lost in the anyone" by "making up for a choice," which means "deciding on an ability-to-be from within your own self" (SZ 268). It can do so, because it is able to sustain its self-understanding guiltily and wholly. By virtue of this ability, its understanding of the possibilities afforded by a situation is not undermined by anxiety, guilt, or death. The possibility of world-collapse is already integrated into the authentic understanding of the situation. Resolute Dasein's self-understanding is therefore "poised for anxiety" (*angstbereit*, SZ 297).

Anticipating or fore-running into death, and taking over one's guilt, form a distinct mode of disclosure, a "reticent, poised-for-anxiety self-projection upon one's ownmost being-guilty" (SZ 297). Drawing on the literal root of *Erschlossenheit* (disclosure), Heidegger calls it *Entschlossenheit*, which translates as decisiveness or RESOLUTENESS. Authenticity is fore-running resoluteness, which "dissipates all fugitive self-concealments" (SZ 310). Note that resoluteness is a "self-projection." Projection is "the existential structure of UNDERSTANDING" (SZ 145), which, in turn, is the "existential being of Dasein's own ability-to-be" (SZ 144). So authentic Dasein exercises an ability to be itself that polarizes the world into a purposive

structure of meanings and solicitations. "Understanding projects itself primarily upon its for-the-sake-of-which, that is … understanding is authentic" (SZ 146). Heidegger simply names this primary projection the authentic ability-to-be-yourself (*Selbstseinkönnen*), which involves the ability-to-be-wholly (*Ganzseinkönnen*) and the ability-to-be-guiltily (*Schuldigseinkönnen*).

In comporting itself authentically toward its death and guilt, Dasein's existence becomes "transparent to itself" (*durchsichtig*, SZ 305, 307–09). "TRANSPARENCY" (*Durchsichtigkeit*) is Heidegger's term for an existential form of self-knowledge. He writes that

> We choose this term to designate "self-knowledge" properly understood [*wohlverstandene "Selbsterkenntnis"*], so as to indicate that this is not about perceptually detecting and inspecting a self-point, but rather about understandingly grasping the full disclosedness of being-in-the-world through its essential, constitutive moments. (SZ 146)

Just as fore-running into death does not require explicitly pondering your mortality, and taking over your guilt does not require mulling over the groundlessness of your commitments, authenticity does not engender a self-conscious awareness of the structure of existence, but rather an understanding that expresses and reveals this structure. Or, as Heidegger puts it, "understanding primarily does not mean: gawking at a SENSE, but understanding yourself in the ability-to-be that unveils itself in the projection" (SZ 263). We can compare the sight (*Sicht*) of lucid self-transparency (*Durchsichtigkeit*) to the CIRCUMSPECTION (*Umsicht*) that accompanies practical competences. A skilled shoemaker, for example, has an understanding of her tools, the materials she works with, etc. This skillful understanding produces an openness in which her environment solicits possible ways of going about her work. Such circumspective openness is not a consciousness of possibilities, but a pattern of solicitations that corresponds to her practical know-how. So an understanding (knowing how to cobble) gives rise to a kind of lucidity (being sensitive to solicitations). Others who lack those competences are not sensitive to those solicitations.

There is a sense in which the shoemaker encounters herself in the hammer, awl, leather, etc. of her workshop. "INTENTIONALITY includes not only directing-yourself-towards entities, and not only understanding the being of entities towards which you are directed, but also the being-unveiled of the self that comports itself" (GA24:225). For authentic Dasein this "being-unveiled of the self" in the environment unveils not only that certain equipment affords certain possibilities; but that the meaningfulness of this equipment depends on her own primary projection of her self-understanding as a shoemaker. In resolute world-disclosure, authentic Dasein is transparent to itself "in the immediacy and originariness of its being-in-the-world" (GA24:244). Authenticity produces an immediacy of being-in-the-world. As Heidegger repeatedly points out, authenticity does not remove one from the world of concerns, but it brings it closer. "Dasein is authentically itself only insofar as it projects itself onto its ownmost ability-to-be, as concernful being-amidst … and solicitous being-with … " (SZ 263). And in resoluteness "the available 'world' does not become a different one in its 'content,' the circle of others is not swapped out" (SZ 298). The authentic shoemaker understands the possibilities as her own, in light of her authentic ability to disclose and press into her own*most* possibility.

Authentic Dasein discloses a concrete "situation," while an inauthentic one knows only the "general circumstances" (*allgemeine Lage*, SZ 300). The possibilities articulated publicly by the anyone are general. The inauthentic shoemaker responds to solicitations that any shoemaker in general could take up. Heidegger also expresses this distinction in terms of happenstance. Inauthentic Dasein discloses the circumstances as largely accidental or haphazard. Authentic Dasein, however,

discloses possibilities that solicit only her, insofar as they are her own and are meaningful only on condition of her own guilty commitment. They do not just happen to be there, but are fundamentally chosen. For this reason, only authentic Dasein can have a fate and suffer the blows of fate, while inauthentic Dasein has no fate and can at most be the victim of happenstance (SZ 384).

Authentic Dasein is individualized, or singled out (*vereinzelt*; see INDIVIDUALIZATION). Again, Heidegger does not mean that authentic Dasein is isolated or separated from others or from its surroundings. It is individualized insofar as it is not dispersed into the anyone-self. Anxiety drains the world of its ordinary familiarity, and authentic Dasein finds itself "not at home" in it. This UNCANNINESS (*Unheimlichkeit*) of the world is nevertheless a way of being in the world. In fact, Heidegger calls it the "basic way of being-in-the-world, even though it is covered up in the everyday" (SZ 277). Since it is not at home in the public interpretation of the possibilities of the world, authentic Dasein cannot retreat to the public sphere. But it can resolutely press into those possibilities on the basis of its own commitment to them and take them up freely, without delusions or self-deception, even joyfully (*gerüstete Freude*, SZ 310). Similarly, just as the public world appears strange, the uncanny ability to press into possibilities is strange to the public discourse. It gives the public nothing to chatter about and does not feed the curiosity of the anyone. So the mode of discourse that expresses the resolute self is reticence (*Verschwiegenheit*).

Finally, authentic Dasein is characterized by a kind of freedom that inauthentic Dasein lacks. Heidegger describes this freedom variously as "being freed from the lostness into possibilities that happen to thrust themselves upon it" (SZ 264), and as "freeing itself for its world" (SZ 298). Lostness entails a kind of inflexibility, insofar as lost Dasein is not able to disclose a meaningful world without relying on public interpretations. For lost Dasein, world-collapse implies a complete loss of the self. Authentic Dasein, on the other hand, has the ability to make fundamental adjustments to what it values and what matters to it. The same resolute projection that structures its world also enables it to restructure it. Since resolute Dasein "authentically takes on in its existence that it is the null ground of its own nothingness" (SZ 306), i.e., since it commits to its world-polarizing projection from the ground up, it also "holds itself free for possibly taking it back" (SZ 308). An authentic Dasein does not use this freedom to take back her commitment to the world flippantly. Having taken a stand, authentic resoluteness implies a constancy (*Ständigkeit*) that underlies phenomena of the identity and persistence of the same self. To be the same self, Heidegger argues, is more than merely the ability to be involved in the same meaning structure over time. It requires, rather, the ability to make a primary projection in terms of which a future and a past can be understood to be relevant to the same self. So the ability to make a primary projection guiltily and wholly underwrites constancy and hence the possible diachronic identity of the self. "Resoluteness is the freedom for giving up a specific decision, if a situation demands it. This does not interrupt the constancy of existence, but precisely confirms it in the instant [*augenblicklich bewährt*]" (SZ 391). So authentic Dasein is entirely, but not inflexibly, committed to a given way the world is disclosed. Heidegger also puts this point by saying that events cannot overtake authentic Dasein. "Since fore-running resoluteness takes account of the possibility of death in its ability-to-be, nothing can make Dasein's authentic existence obsolete" (SZ 307).

Heidegger's discussion of authenticity borrows from the philosophical tradition, especially work by early existentialists. The idea of a world-grounding commitment and the central role of anxiety derive from Kierkegaard's characterization of a religiousness that is higher than the

ethical. Kierkegaard and Nietzsche both disdain conformism and emphasize a radical individualism that cuts one off from the herd. The Romantics developed an ideal of selfhood as gathering oneself out of dispersion. Aristotle's *phronimos* discloses a concrete situation through excellence of practical involvement. These writers are concerned with broadly ethical views, and their versions of authenticity are clearly evaluative. Heidegger, by contrast, declares that the main contribution of the concept of authenticity is methodological. It allows a phenomenology of the entire existential structure. He claims explicitly that "inauthenticity does not signify a 'lesser' being or 'lower' degree of being. Rather, inauthenticity can characterize Dasein in its fullest concreteness, in its busyness, excitement, interestedness, and relish" (SZ 43). Nevertheless, it is hard to deny that authenticity in *Being and Time* also functions as an evaluative ideal. Authentic Dasein is free, lucid, immediate, and concrete. It is honest, courageous, and truthful. It faces fate and does not flee or cover up its possible collapse. Heidegger presents authentic existence as a better, more valuable mode of existence, though also a more difficult one.

Stephan Käufer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ: 42–43, 146, 175, 180, 232–34, 260–70, 287–88, 295–301, 305–10, 322–23, 382–84; GA20:390; GA21:220–34; GA24:242–44, 405–12

FURTHER READING

Blattner 2013, Carman 2005, Käufer 2015, Withy 2015a, Wrathall 2015b

AUTONOMY (*SELBSTSTÄNDIGKEIT*). SEE CONSTANCY.

AVAILABLE, THE (*DAS ZUHANDE*). SEE AVAILABLENESS.

18.
AVAILABLENESS (*ZUHANDENHEIT*)

AVAILABLENESS REFERS TO the *way* or *category of being* of the entities Heidegger calls EQUIPMENT (*Zeug*), also translated as *useful things* (Stambaugh) and even *paraphernalia* (see Haugeland 2013 and Blattner 2007). Different translations of *Zuhandenheit*, the German term translated here as "availableness," are in circulation: Macquarrie and Robinson translate it as *readiness-to-hand*, while Stambaugh's translation of *Being and Time* and Kisiel's translation of GA20 use *handiness*; in this Lexicon, we follow the lead of Dreyfus (1990), who prefers *availability*. A virtue of "readiness-to-hand" and "handiness" is that they reproduce the reference in the original German to the *hand*, which indicates the primacy of our making *use* of the entities being categorized, in many cases by actually taking hold of them (for example, Heidegger's famous hammer), but also more figuratively as being *to* or *on* hand (and so *available*). In *Being and Time*, the term is introduced in §15 (Division 1, chapter 3: "The Being of the Entities Encountered in the Environment"): "the kind of being which equipment possesses – in which it manifests itself in its own right – we call '*availableness*'" (SZ 69). As this introductory sentence suggests, the category of availableness is most clearly keyed to fabricated entities such as hammers, what is ordinarily deemed equipment; however, the scope of the term in *Being and Time* appears to be much broader. All manner of things are manifest, or show up, as available, according to Heidegger: "the wood is a forest of timber, the mountain a quarry of rock; the river is water-power, the wind is wind 'in the sails'" (SZ 70). This sense of the environing world as a vast array of *resources* or STANDING RESERVE is something Heidegger will later view more critically in his discussions of TECHNOLOGY and the notion of the INVENTORY (*Ge-Stell*).

Heidegger makes two claims in the lead-up to introducing his term of art, each of which is crucial for understanding the nature and significance of the category in the overall economy of *Being and Time*: first, that Heidegger's adducing this category serves to "bring to completion . . . that understanding of being which belongs already to DASEIN and which 'comes alive' in any of its dealings with entities" (SZ 67); and, second, that "taken strictly, there 'is' no such thing as *an* equipment" (SZ 68). The first of these two claims signals the importance of this category in terms of delineating – or interpreting – the kind of understanding Dasein possesses in its everyday moving about in the world. Heidegger stresses here how "misleading" it is to conceive of understanding entities in this way – as available – as a matter of "putting ourselves in position" to deal with them, "for the kind of being which belongs to such concernful dealings is not one into which we need to put ourselves first. This is the way in which everyday Dasein always *is*: when I open the door, for instance, I use the latch" (SZ 67). What Heidegger says here indicates that availableness has a kind of *priority* in relation to OCCURRENTNESS (*Vorhandenheit*): in Dasein's making sense of what there is, making sense of things as equipment is antecedent to making sense of things as mere things. For Heidegger, this claim carries *ontological* significance, rather than being a matter of just how things happen to go with Dasein's understanding. The idea here is that there is no route in terms of understanding or making sense from the occurrent to the available: anything that suggests itself as such a route either falsifies the phenomenology

by depicting the available as a kind of "subjective colouring" (SZ 71), appealing to an obscure notion of VALUES as something with which mere things are "invested" (SZ 68), or implicitly presupposing the kind of understanding at issue (SZ §21, especially SZ 99). The priority at issue here thus plays an important role in Heidegger's sustained critique of Descartes' dualistic ontology of mind and matter, and is relevant to assessing any view (such as more contemporary forms of materialism) that inherits much of the conceptual machinery of Descartes' view even while rejecting the dualism.

The second claim indicates what is distinctive about availableness in contrast to occurrentness, namely, that what is available is what it is in virtue of having a place or playing a role in a broader *totality*: "to the being of any equipment there always belongs a totality of equipment, in which it can be this equipment that it is" (SZ 68). Available equipment is constituted by what Heidegger calls referential relations: "in the 'in-order-to' as a structure there lies an *assignment* or *reference* of something to something" (SZ 68; see REFERENCE). Hammers, for example, *refer* to other items of equipment (nails, for example), as well as purposes (driving nails into boards), projects (building things), and self-understandings (such as being a carpenter). Reference here should not be understood on the model of linguistic reference: a hammer does not refer to nails in the way that the word "nails" refers to nails. Rather, the idea here is that the significance of hammers – what hammers *are* – is bound up with the significance of nails: without nails and all the various activities in which hammers are caught up, nothing would *be* a hammer. This second claim regarding the way items of equipment are constituted in terms of a "referential totality" relates back to the first claim, as it is as much about how items of equipment are *understood* as what items of equipment *are*: the understanding that "comes alive" in our dealings with equipment is an implicit grasp of this referential structure (understanding what a hammer *is* involves understanding what it is *for*, namely, hammering in nails, and this understanding comes alive whenever we take hold of a hammer and so use it). As Heidegger notes in his lecture course, *History of the Concept of Time*, "the things of the environing world are encountered in and from references" (GA20:257) and, shortly before that:

> It thus becomes clear that the references are precisely the AFFORDANCES in which the concernful occupation dwells; it does not dwell among isolated things of the environing world and certainly not among thematically or theoretically perceived objects. (GA20:253)

That "concernful occupation" does not "dwell among . . . theoretically perceived objects" again underscores the kind of priority Heidegger accords to availableness over occurrentness when it comes to our everyday, pre-ontological understanding of being.

Although the term availableness does not appear in Heidegger's writings and lectures until the years immediately prior to *Being and Time* (Kisiel 1993 traces the term only to the GA20 lectures), the ideas animating the term are present from very early on in Heidegger's thinking. As far back as the 1919 lecture course *The Idea of Philosophy and the Problem of Worldview*, Heidegger emphasizes the ways in which everyday understanding is oriented toward entities whose meaning or significance cannot be grasped in isolation:

> In the experience of seeing the lectern something is given *to me* from out of an immediate environment. This environmental milieu (lectern, book, blackboard, notebook, fountain pen, caretaker, student fraternity, tram-car, motor-car, etc.)

does not consist just of things, objects, which are then conceived as meaning this and this; rather, the meaningful is primary and immediately given to me without any mental detours across thing-oriented apprehension. Living in an environment, it signifies to me everywhere and always, everything has the character of world. (GA56/57:72–73)

Notice how even in this short passage from an early lecture the key features of Heidegger's account of available entities are foreshadowed: the emphasis on a totality, what is here referred to as an "environmental milieu"; the primacy of our grasp of meaningful entities, and so the rejection of any kind of "thing-oriented apprehension" as basic or original; and the connection between equipment and the notion of signification. This connection is reiterated in his 1922 lectures on Aristotle: "*Meaningfulness* is a categorial determination of the world; the objects of a world, worldly, world-some objects, are lived inasmuch as they embody the character of meaningfulness" (GA61:90).[1]

Although Heidegger does not continue to deploy the Dasein-availableness-occurrentness categorical structure for very long beyond *Being and Time*, he continues to appeal to equipment (*Zeug*) as a distinctive category whose defining characteristics are those he put forward in *Being and Time*. He often does so in order to contrast the category of equipment with some new category whose defining characteristics he is attempting to articulate (that there are new categories to delineate indicates the provisionality of the tripartite structure of the categories in *Being and Time*). In his 1929–30 lectures, *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics: World, Finitude, Solitude*, Heidegger revisits the notion of equipment as a way of bringing out what is distinctive about *bodily organs* (as well as the whole organisms that have them). In the course of the lectures, he explicitly refers his audience back to his discussion in §15 and subsequent sections in *Being and Time* (see GA29/30:313). As Heidegger notes, a bodily organ can be thought of as an instrument (*Werkzeug*), which suggests an affinity with equipment more generally (in framing his discussion, he cites the biologist Wilhelm Roux's definition of an organism as a "complex of instruments"). Heidegger's ensuing discussion, however, emphasizes the essential differences between equipment and bodily organs. The hammer has what Heidegger calls "potentiality," which indicates its usefulness for hammering, but the bodily organ has what he calls a "capacity." The eye is capable of seeing, whereas the hammer only has the potential to be used for hammering but is not itself capable of hammering. Actually, as Heidegger notes, saying the eye is capable of seeing is not quite right: it is the organism that *can see* and so it is the organism that *has eyes*. The sense of "having" here indicates what is fundamentally different about organs versus equipment: bodily organs are incorporated into an organism to which they are subservient. Although items of equipment do not stand alone in the sense that their significance is bound up with a broader totality of equipment and activities, any particular item of equipment is still a kind of freestanding entity: a hammer, for example, is there to be used appropriately by more or less anyone with the competence to do so; the hammer is available to be used, but lies idle until someone actually picks it up and uses it (see GA29/30:§§51–58).

Heidegger again revisits the category of equipment in "The Origin of the Work of Art" in developing a new tripartite scheme of thing-equipment-artwork. Heidegger appeals to equipment as the category where the distinction between matter and form applies:

---

[1] See also Heidegger's sketch for a book on Aristotle, also from 1922, published as "Phenomenological Interpretations in Connection with Aristotle: An Indication of the Hermeneutic Situation," in S; see especially 113–16. I am grateful to Denis McManus for calling my attention to these early discussions of Aristotle.

> matter and form are determinations of entities which find their true home in the essential nature of equipment. This name designates what is manufactured expressly for use and usage. Matter and form are in no way original determinations belonging to the thingness of the mere thing. (GA5:13/10)[2]

We can see in this passage a scaling back of the scope of availableness: whereas in *Being and Time*, everything from hammers to livestock to wind and rock is manifest as available, and so as a kind of equipment, here Heidegger draws a sharp distinction between those things that are "manufactured expressly for use and usage" and what he calls mere things. (It is also worth noting that we can see in this essay the beginnings of a rehabilitation of the notion of the THING that Heidegger will continue into subsequent decades: whereas in *Being and Time*, the notion of the thing appears as only a kind of pejorative to designate the first step in the ontologically wrong direction for designating the entities that are manifest in our everyday activity, here and beyond the notion takes on a much more positive valence.) In the account offered in "The Origin of the Work of Art," equipment lies midway on a spectrum with mere things at one end and works of ART at the other, such that:

> the nearest and authentic things are always the things of use that are all around us. So the piece of equipment is half thing since it is characterized by thingliness. Yet it is more, since, at the same time, it is half artwork. On the other hand, it is less, since it lacks the self-sufficiency of the artwork. Equipment occupies a curious position intermediate between thing and work – if we may be permitted such a calculated ordering. (GA5:14/10)

Although Heidegger here uses concepts familiar from *Being and Time* such as *usefulness* or *serviceability* (*Dienlichkeit)* to articulate the nature of equipment, he no longer uses the terms availableness and available.

David R. Cerbone

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA 21:79; GA 22:158–62, 171–74; GA 23:21–22, 26, 51, 83–84, 150–51, 165, 237; GA 24:36–37, 76–78, 99–102, 169–71

FURTHER READING

Blattner 2007, Brandom 2002b, Dreyfus 1991, Haugeland 2013, Kisiel 1993, McManus 2012

---

[2] See also the earlier GA24:149–57, where Heidegger similarly links the form–matter distinction to "the productive comportment of Dasein."

19.
AVERAGENESS (*DURCHSCHNITTLICHKEIT*)

AVERAGENESS (DURCHSCHNITTLICHKEIT) IS the way of everyday undifferentiated existing, in which Heidegger can analyze DASEIN without having to analyze a specific, determinate Dasein. This makes it possible for Heidegger's analytic of Dasein to spell out the general EXISTENTIAL structures of all Dasein without attending to the concrete possibilities in terms of which any particular Dasein understands its own being. Along with distantiality (*Abständigkeit*) and leveling down (*Einebnung*), averageness constitutes the PUBLIC-NESS (*Öffentlichkeit*) of existence, which is the specific disclosure of the ANYONE.

Heidegger claims that average Dasein in this sense is not an abstraction from concrete Dasein, nor "something like a 'general subject' that hovers above several" (SZ 128), or a "hazy indefiniteness" (SZ 44). Rather, the analysis of Dasein in its averageness yields "concise [*prägnant*] structures that do not differ from ontological determinations of an authentic being of Dasein" (SZ 44). This is because each Dasein exists first and foremost (*zunächst und zumeist*) in this average way of being and only achieves its determinateness from within it. And while it is easily overlooked, averageness is "not nothing, but a positive phenomenal characteristic" of Dasein (SZ 43). Heidegger's purpose is to uncover existential structures, and average existing brings some such structures to light.

Heidegger gives more details of this "positive phenomenal characteristic" in his discussion of the anyone (*das Man*). The anyone is the undifferentiated "who" of everyday existing. It maintains and propagates an average UNDERSTANDING, average DISPOSEDNESS, and average DISCOURSE – i.e., construals of the everyday world, decreeing what is acceptable, what is appropriate, and what counts as successful. With such understanding and disposedness, the anyone has the same basic structure as any given Dasein: its being is at issue for it, or is at stake for it. But the being that is at issue for the anyone is not to be this or that person, but precisely the averageness of everyday existing. It understands and is affected by entities in an average way and is concerned to maintain and reinforce this averageness.

Not only is the anyone *like* each one of us, in the sense that it is structurally analogous. But it is, in an important sense, a big part of us. The anyone "is an existential; and as a primordial phenomenon it belongs to Dasein's positive CONSTITUTION [*Verfassung*]" (SZ 129). Each person exists, first and foremost, in an average self-understanding. The first, and basic background understanding of the world is the average understanding maintained and propagated by the anyone. Each Dasein can only be called upon to be its own, authentic self on the basis of this prior understanding.

The averageness of the disclosure of the anyone has certain limits, because in its average EVERYDAYNESS, Dasein comports itself toward its own being in the mode of "fleeing before it and forgetting itself" (SZ 44). Averageness in general expresses itself in IDLE TALK, levels down exceptional phenomena, and reduces genuine insight to platitudes. And in particular the average understanding of DEATH, CONSCIENCE, and GUILT covers up their genuine content. Fleeing and forgetting grants inauthentic Dasein a familiar "shelter and hiding place" (SZ 273). It is easy

and comforting to let oneself be guided by the average understanding and to be carried along by public standards of appropriateness and success. Worries about finitude, death, guilt, and responsibility are assuaged and explained away by the average understanding of the anyone.

If, however, Dasein is receptive to the call of conscience, the anyone collapses away. The call summons the particular self to its own ability to be, and in so doing reveals the average understanding of the anyone as irrelevant. "Through the call the self is robbed of its shelter and hiding-place and brought before itself" (SZ 273). There is no average understanding of the call of conscience, because it calls precisely the individual Dasein. Similarly, there is no average understanding of death as the "ownmost" possibility of Dasein, and there is no average experience of anxiety.

Since averageness systematically covers up all phenomena that could reveal the structures of authentic existence, Heidegger's phenomenological analysis of average Dasein cannot exhaust all structures of Dasein. In Division Two of *Being and Time* he therefore moves beyond average Dasein and attends to the resolute, authentic Dasein.

Stephan Käufer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 43–44, 127–29; GA20:338–39; GA63:31–32

20.
AWAITING (GEWÄRTIGEN)

Awaiting is an attitude in which one lets something which is not yet present bear on one. Heidegger tells us, "as care, Dasein is essentially ahead of itself" (SZ 337). Thus, every mode of understanding the future discloses Dasein's ability-to-be. Awaiting designates the inauthentic mode of being related to the future (and *anticipation* designates its authentic mode; for more on anticipation, see DEATH).

The German word that *awaiting* translates (*Gewärtigen*) is derived from the verb *erwarten*, which means "to expect" or "to be prepared for" (see EXPECTING). Heidegger uses this term as part of what he describes as "an existential-ontological interpretation of Aristotle's definition of 'TIME'" (SZ 421), where he appears to have Husserl's notion of protention in mind. One awaits the future by making it present (*gegenwärtigend*) to oneself in advance; awaiting is "the making-present which awaits and retains" as part of knowing what one is about (SZ 534).

Awaiting and expecting are not the same because awaiting makes expectation possible. Heidegger notes the difference between awaiting and expecting in §68 (b), "The TEMPORALITY OF DISPOSEDNESS." Clearly, he says, awaiting is part of the constitution of fear, for example. But "this means that the temporality of fear is one that is *inauthentic*" (341). Then, is fear an expectation of something fearful that is coming? No, that expectation might not be fear. I can expect something fearful without the MOOD of fearfulness. In order for my expectation also to be fear, I must have a mood in which "what is threatening *come[s] back* to one's factically concernful ability-to-be. . . . The awaiting which fears is one which is afraid 'for itself'; that is to say, fearing in the face of something, is in each case a fearing *about*" (SZ 341). If I await something fearful, then I am sensible or conscious of its fearfulness. To await the fearful is for it to touch me existentially.

Heidegger says, "*only because* factical Dasein *is* thus *awaiting* its ability-to-be, and *is awaiting* this ability in terms of that with which it concerns itself, can it *expect* [*erwarten*] anything and wait for it" (SZ 337). One awaits the inauthentic future, touched by one's inauthentic possibility, making it possible to say "I expect this or that."

James E. Faulconer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 337, 339–42, 421, 534

FURTHER READING

Dastur 1990, 74–76

B

BE (*BESTEHEN*). SEE STANDING RESERVE.

BEGINNING (*ANFANG*). SEE INCEPTION.

BEHAVIOR (*VERHALTEN*). SEE RESTRAINT.

BEHOLD (*ANSCHAUEN*). SEE INTUITION.

BE-ING (*SEYN*). SEE BEYNG.

21.
BEING (*SEIN*): IN *BEING AND TIME*

A s you begin reading this entry, in all likelihood you are in a familiar place (your room, the library) surrounded by familiar things (this volume, a desk, a pen, a cup of coffee or tea, and so on). Briefly survey the scene before you. Let me ask you now to close your eyes while contemplating the bare fact, worthy of some kind of wonder, that things are *there* at all. Then open your eyes and reacquaint yourself with those familiar things within the frame of this wonder. If you are struck by the remarkable fact of things *being there* at all, you might find yourself entertaining the following question: what exactly is it for things *to be*? This is one formulation of what Heidegger calls 'the question of being' (the *Seinsfrage*). This question is not asking *why* there is something, or some things, rather than nothing. Nor is it asking for some kind of list of *which* things there are. It is rather asking: what is it for things *to be* (at all)? This is a breathtakingly abstract question, to be sure. Who knows how to begin answering it? It is not entirely clear that the question makes sense. Nor is it obvious that it doesn't. Heidegger's project in *Being and Time* and surrounding work is to reawaken in his readers a questioning spirit, a genuine sense of perplexity, about what being is all about.

One difficulty in thinking about how one might answer the question can be brought out by comparing the question of being with the question of elephants. If the question of being asks *what is it for things to be?* the question of elephants asks: *what is it for elephants to be*? The question of elephants asks, in other words: what does it take to be an elephant? This question asks about the class of things picked out by "elephant." Answering this question would require identifying the characteristic features that distinguish elephants (prehensile trunk, big ears) from non-elephants. This exercise presupposes a domain of things that are (that have "being") that can be divided into those things that qualify as elephants and those things that do not. However, we are not able to proceed this way with "being." For, unlike "elephant," "being" cannot differentiate among things in the domain. After all, everything in the domain qualifies as something which is. Aristotle and his scholastic followers thereby noted that being is not a genus or class of things (SZ 3–4). Accordingly, "being" is not susceptible to the classical form of definition – well suited to elephants, cats, jars of pickles, weapons of mass destruction, petunias, numbers, and socks – made from the closest genus and the specific difference.

Is there nothing, then, to say about the meaning of "being"? The inability of traditional definition to capture "being," Heidegger points out, does not demonstrate that nothing can be said about being. It shows us instead that to be something – *being* a being – cannot be conceived of as *a* being. The claim that being (*Sein*) in this sense "is" not among the things which are (*Seiende*) – that *to be* a being is not itself a member of the set of *beings* – is what

Heidegger came to dub the principle of "ontological difference" (GA 24): being "is" not a being.

It is worth stressing immediately that *distinguishing* being from beings is a far cry from the idea that being amounts to its own self-standing theme *independent* of anything to do with beings. For Heidegger, at least the early Heidegger, the theme of being extends *no further* than the being *of* beings. For clarity's sake, then, it is worth partnering the principle of ontological difference with what one might call its inverse principle, the principle of ontological unity: being "is" always the being of beings (SZ 9).

Now, one may provisionally grant that being "is" not *a* being (difference) but "is" always *of* beings (unity), but still doubt that there is much, if anything, to say about "being." Heidegger *identifies* philosophy, somewhat maniacally, with the science of being. The question quickly arises: is there really an identifiable topic here? Heidegger:

> What is the situation here with philosophy's object? Can something like being be imagined? If we try to do this, doesn't our head start to swim? Indeed, at first we are baffled and find ourselves clutching at thin air. A being – that's something, a table, a chair, a tree, the sky, a body, some words, an action. A being yes indeed – but being? (GA24:17).

We do of course use the verb "to be" throughout our waking lives – "The sun is out," "I am blue," "the elections are over." But the sheer pervasiveness and familiarity of our use of "is," and other cognates of the verb "to be," itself suggests that we are dealing with an expression the sense of which is so primitive, so thin – so *flat* – it can hardly mark out a fertile topic for philosophical investigation. If not an invitation to clutch at "thin air," what precisely is the topic of this science of being?

Heidegger was not the first philosopher to appreciate that being is elusive and that motivating the study of it takes work. (Aristotle claimed in the *Metaphysics* that the science of being must be *sought out*.) To identify being as a viable topic, we might begin by registering that in everyday life we operate with determinate conceptions, expressed linguistically and otherwise, of what it is for various kinds of things to be. These conceptions do not take generally take the form of worked out theories but they are nonetheless understood (more or less). Consider the following three brief examples to illustrate.

To be a rook is to move and capture in the appropriate ways. Those ways are specified by the rules of the game of chess, which lay out the field of possibilities for being, among other pieces, a rook. For example, if a rook is moved diagonally, like a bishop, something is awry. The "rook" in this case, thanks to a wayward chess player, is flouting the standards that make a rook what it is, and so, at least at this moment, *could not* truly be a rook. Those who understand chess, and so make sense of rooks *as* rooks, would rule this move out, and then no doubt proceed to coax the piece back into the field of play. To be a rook, after all, is to accord with ontological standards, in this case the rules of the game.

To be a hammer is to be able, when well wielded, to drive in nails (among other things). The field of possibilities for being a hammer has developed through history by human agents engaging in the practice of carpentry. If one picks up a hammer to discover that it is made of butter, one has been taken in. It is a gimmick, or maybe a work of art. The

"hammer" is flouting the functional standards that make hammers what they are, and so *could not* be a real hammer. Those who understand carpentry, and so make sense of hammers *as* hammers, appreciate this fake hammer for what it is, and would insist on its unreality if challenged. To be a real or actual hammer, after all, is to accord with certain ontological, in this case, functional, standards.

To be an ordinary physical thing is to behave in more or less stable and predictable ways. The "laws" of ordinary medium-sized things lay out the field of possibilities for being such things. For example, if a physical thing, say a rock, popped in and out of existence depending on whether a drawer it is in is open or closed, something would be awry, and would be recognized as such by any competent perceiver. The "rock" would be flouting the standards of substantial independence and persistence that hold for physical objects, and so *could not* be any such thing. Those who understand physical objects, and so make sense of them as such, would find themselves compelled in this situation to check again, and might very well worry that they have been drugged. For to be an ordinary physical thing is to accord with certain ontological standards.

These examples are meant to show that beings must "live up" to standards in order to count as being. Such standards are accordingly ontological standards, standards concerning what it is for beings *to be* as opposed to *not* be. Ontological standards are, one might say, the "ground rules" of beings. Ontology is the systematic study of these "ground rules." So, rather than a flat and primitive topic – or a thin or empty one – being seems to have some structure and sense. As the above examples suggest, being does not make up an undifferentiated structure. Being, rather, divides into *regions of being*, a claim endorsed in one form or another by philosophers from Aristotle to Aquinas to Husserl, Carnap, and Ryle: being "is" regionalised.

Three regions figure prominently in *Being and Time*: the being of EQUIPMENT (*Zeug*), the being of substance ("mere things"), and the being of DASEIN. Heidegger also discusses regions of being in more specific terms, in terms of "subject-matters" or areas of being (*Sachgebiete*). Several examples are offered: mathematical entities (e.g., numbers), physical things, living things, God, works of ART. The things that occupy these respective regions of being have their own distinctive mode of being (*Seinsart*), which are specified in terms of categories (*Grundbegriffe*) that articulate what it is to be an occupant in the respective areas of that which is. These categories are "basic" because they lay out the constitution (*Grundverfassung*) of the entities that populate their respective region. The use of *Begriff* here, often translated as "concept," is not meant to refer to a psychological item; it is a form of intelligibility that pertains to what is. (More on this below.)

Readers will be familiar with the contrast in philosophy between abstract entities (e.g., numbers, sets, propositions) and material objects (e.g., sticks and stones). Heidegger's doctrine of the regionalization of being, or of distinct modes of being, is an elaboration and diversification of that style of contrast. The reductive or homogenizing impulse in ontology present from Democritus to Quine and van Inwagen is not shared by Heidegger, for whom good ontology is the attempt to capture the structure and texture of the world in all of its diversity. Heidegger accordingly sides with the spirit of Aristotle's remark that "being is said in many ways." However:

> This appreciation of diversity does not preclude the pursuit of the idea of being as
> a *unity* of a topic. Arguably we need *some* kind of "a single unifying concept of being"

to be entitled to call these different *ways* of being different ways of being. (GA24:250)

The term "being" is meant to include the span of all possible regions. But the problem of the regional multiplicity of being, if posed universally, includes an investigation into the unity of this general term "being," into the way in which the general term "being" varies with different regional meanings. This is the problem of the unity of the idea of being and its regional variants (GA26:151). Heidegger claims in fact that regional ontology ultimately remains "blind and perverted" (SZ 11) without clarification of the sense of being as such. Hence, according to Heidegger: being "is" a unity.

We saw above that Heidegger agrees with Aristotle that the unity of being is not the unity of a genus. Heidegger suggests at the outset of *Being and Time* that there might be some promise in the Aristotelian idea of a unity of analogy, but says no more – and later suggests that the idea of analogy does little more than *name* the problem of unity rather than provide an answer to it. So, an outstanding problem is what the unity of being consists of (and indeed whether being must be a unity at all).

One rather minimal sense of unity across the diverse regions is a commonality with respect to the internal articulation of any mode of being. About anything, no matter its characteristic region, one can ask *what* it is, asking about its "nature" or intrinsic character. (About Dasein one asks "who" it is, but that is a special form of the relevant "what" question.) About anything, no matter its characteristic region, one can also ask *whether* it is. An accurate response to the first kind of question has traditionally been taken to give the essence of something. Heidegger's successor term for this is "what-being"(*Was*-sein). An accurate response to the second kind of question – is it, or is it not – has traditionally been taken to give the existence or "actuality" of something. Heidegger's successor term for this is "that-being" (*Dass*-sein). What-being and that-being (if you want: whatness and thatness) *articulate* a way of being, a distinction that Heidegger credits to the scholastics and dubs the "basic articulation" of being: being "is" articulated.

Now, since a mode of being does not pertain to any particular entity on its own, but in principle a whole lot of entities, the what-being that partly articulates a mode of being (and so is characteristic of a region) specifies the terms in which the entities of a region are individuated as the determinate entities that they are; the concern is with what one might call essential identity. Note, then, that the description of a what-being does not give you the essential identity of any *particular* entity. This would be what Heidegger calls an ontic question, a question pertaining to beings. The description rather offers the resources one would need to specify the essential identity of *any* particular intraregional entity, such as it is, and therewith gives sense and substance to the distinction between what is essential and what is accidental vis-à-vis that way of being an entity. This is what Heidegger calls an ontological question, pertaining to the being of beings.

Turn to what is perhaps Heidegger's most well-known ontological distinction to put some tires on all this, namely the contrast between readiness-to-hand and presence-at-hand. Heidegger says about ready-to-hand items, or equipment:

> The specific [determinate] thisness of a piece of equipment, its individuation, is not determined primarily by space and time, i.e. by a determinate space and time-position. . . . Equipment is essentially something "in-order-to." (GA24:273)

Note that the relevant contrast between modes of being here is that between an item of equipment, such as it is, versus a material thing, an entity determined primarily by space and time position. This formulation of the distinction expresses the individuating function of a mode of being. The what-being of an item of equipment is constituted by its role, what it is *for*. Heidegger's key move here is to note that such items are interdependent entities: what it is to be an item of equipment makes no sense apart from its relations to other such items in a holistically structured ensemble of roles. Enabling the driving in of nails, for example, is the role that befits a hammer, such as it is. Contrast, say, the shape and mass of a stone, characteristic properties which it can have, material thing that it is, apart from anything else. The very identity of an item of equipment – hence its individuation – calls upon its functional relations to other items, in contrast to a material thing. Of course, many items of equipment are made up of, or composed of, physical stuff. But it hardly follows from this that an item of equipment is identical to that stuff. So, modes of being give you the resources to individuate entities: the claim here is that an item of equipment is not numerically identical to the physical matter that makes it up.

The that-being of an item of equipment is constituted by its AVAILABLENESS (or readiness-to-hand). To be available is to have a current "space" of possibilities of use. There is at once a yes-or-no answer to the question of whether an item of equipment is and an indication of the kind of considerations at stake in considering the question. To say that the that-being of an entity lies in its current possibilities of use is to say that its that-being stands or falls with the nexus of holistically structured roles in terms of which it is what it is. Thus, the typewriter has ceased to be, or at least it is on its way out. (Something like "grades" of being are probably apt in the region of the available, marked as it is by historicality.)

So, in sum, you can raise the what-being and that-being questions about different modes of being and different answers will be delivered. This is to do regional ontology. But note an underlying commitment about unity here: for any and everything, no matter its region, *to be* is to be articulated by a characteristic what-being and that-being.

Heidegger says early on in SZ, in the closest we have to a definition of "being," that "being is that which *determines* entities as entities, that in terms of which beings are already understood" (SZ 6). We have seen how the ideas of what-being and that-being give substance to the sense of the *determinacy* of things. But what about the clause after the comma? And how does it fit with the clause before the comma? Some commentators argue that we should distinguish two senses of "being," with one captured by the formulation before the comma, and the other captured by the formulation after the comma. Other commentators take Heidegger at his word that both formulations pertain to one idea of being, but since the post-comma formulation has to do with *understanding*, it must be that Heidegger is some kind of idealist about being. After all, if what *determines* entities as entities is what we *understand* entities to be, then the being of things seems to be reduced to our understanding of them, which sounds like a form of idealism. This second group of commentators is right to resist "disambiguating" being, but they are wrong to privilege what comes after the comma in their attempt to reconcile the pre-comma and post-comma formulations.

Return to our handy items of equipment to bring out an alternative way of seeing what appears before the comma and what appears after the comma as belonging harmoniously to one coherent formulation. Heidegger says:

> The way of being which equipment possesses – in which it manifests itself in its own right – we call availableness (*Zuhandenheit*). (GA24)

In this passage our problematic is contained in that small stretch of phrasing between the two dashes. The "in its own right" marks the ontological reach at work in the notion of being. The "in which it manifests itself" marks the theme of givenness to understanding at work in the notion of being. "Being" as Heidegger uses it intends to encompass both the idea of a way for something to be and the idea of a way in which something manifests itself to those who are in a position to understand that which presents itself.

That is, specifying a mode of being includes, in addition to the sense of "ESSENCE" (what-being) and "existence" (that-being) that applies to a respective region of being, the characteristic mode of *access* appropriate to the intraregional entities. When it comes to equipment, it is here that the appeal to hands-on *use* comes in as the characteristic form of engagement with such entities. It is characteristic insofar as it lets the entities at issue show up as they are. After all, the more we seize hold of it and use it, the more we are "tuning into" the nexus of roles in terms of which the entity is what it is. So, the mode of access (here: "hands-on use") lets a thing (here: an item of equipment) manifest itself in its own right (here: its role), which is why the specification of access, or of understanding, belongs to the ontological investigation.

Here it is worth guarding against a misunderstanding. Describing modes of access or understanding is not, on Heidegger's view, an isolated component of the exercise, as if "the phenomenological bit," the part about how the world shows up, or is manifest, is intelligible in isolation from the bit to do with the ways of the world. (That would be an attempt to separate the two sides of the comma.) Note first that "access," and indeed "understanding," on Heidegger's uses of these terms – and, as ordinarily understood – are broadly *factive*. Heidegger stresses this in his formulation of "access" to ready-to-hand in terms of an item of equipment "genuinely showing" itself in "dealings cut to its own measure" (SZ 69). Second, and more substantively, Heidegger holds that part of what you understand when you understand what it is *to be* something is what it is to access it. So Heidegger's inclusion of the question of access, or understanding, in his account of a mode of being, far from being an optional add-on, is internal to his topic. This link between what it is to be something and what it is to access it, or understand it, is central to Heidegger's account of being on to things (his "theory of intentionality"). For Heidegger thinks these ontological commitments – about essence, existence, and so forth – are at work in, integral to, our natural first-order intercourse with the world. Without such commitments, we wouldn't be in a position to make sense of entities as the entities that they are. Accordingly, the reach of Heidegger's phenomenological investigation is at once ontologically robust and modest: robust, because the investigation includes the things themselves, but modest, for the investigation goes no further than the metaphysical material "always already" contained in our natural making sense of things. The task so understood is to unpack that material and make it explicit by, as it were, "colluding" with our sense-making amid things. By a form of reflective attention to the entities with which we comport and our comportment with them, the phenomenologist spells out modes of being. The misunderstanding worth guarding against, then, would be the thought that there is one question, *what it is for things to be what they are*, and then a second

question, *how those things are given or are understood*, as if you could address these questions independently of each other. On Heidegger's view, these two questions address aspects of one investigation. The notion of being, suitably understood, is the heading under which these aspects have their place. So when you learn about modes of being, you learn about what it takes to access or understand entities (traditionally: the side of the subject) by learning about what it is for those entities to be (traditionally: the side of the object), *and vice versa*. In short: being "is" the form of intelligibility of what is.

Joseph K. Schear

22.
BEING (*SEIN*): AFTER *BEING AND TIME*

I N HEIDEGGER'S WORKS after *Being and Time*, "being" names the temporal-spatial unfolding way (or process) wherein and whereby all entities (in their BEINGNESS) issue forth and come to be.

In Heidegger's own view, stated innumerable times over the course of his long lifetime of thinking, the matter of being was the fundamental matter of his thought (*die Sache selbst*). Whether in the early, middle, or late years, he maintained that the question of being (*die Seinsfrage*) was the question that first and foremost propelled and sustained his thinking. In a letter dated October 20, 1966 to Manfred Frings, who was the convener of a "Heidegger Symposium" in Chicago, Heidegger wrote:

> I would be most delighted if it were possible to orient the discussion at once – in the first moments of the symposium – purely and decisively toward the matter (*die Sache*). In this way, there could develop, instead of a "Heidegger Symposium," a *Colloquium on the Question of Being*. For it is this question – and it alone – that determines the path of my thinking and its boundaries. (GA16:684/LH 19)

Nevertheless, he infrequently approached the matter of being in a direct manner; rather, he brought to language a rich array of names and phrases, each of which attempted to bring into view a fundamental feature of the "*Ur*-phenomenon" that the earliest Greek thinkers had named "being."

What we may glean from his lifelong reflections and meditations is that being (*Sein*) lets entities (*das Seiende*) be in their beingness (*die Seiendheit*). As he put this simply and elegantly in 1945: "Now beyng is that which lets each and every being be what it is and how it is, precisely because beyng is the freeing that lets every single thing rest in its abiding fulness [reading *Wesen*]; that is, beyng safeguards each and every thing" (GA73.1:879). In other words, being, which is not a being itself, is the temporal-spatial way whereby and wherein all entities issue forth, come to be, in their beingness, that is, in their full appearance or "full look" (the ancient Greek philosophical terms *eidos* or *morphē*). Being is the pure emerging of all that emerges (*phusis*). Being is the pure manifesting of all that is manifest (*alêtheia*). Being is the pure laying-out and gathering of all that is (the primordial *Logos*). This understanding of being, although already in evidence in the early work, came into fullest view in his writings and reflections after *Being and Time*.

1   TO "B" OR NOT TO "B"

The Heidegger scholarship in English is divided on whether to use the capitalized word "Being" to refer to Heidegger's original and distinctive understanding of the age-old term. The capitalization is meant to indicate that Heidegger's fundamental concern is not to be confused with the traditional metaphysical concern with being as BEINGNESS,

that is, with what Plato and Aristotle and the subsequent metaphysical tradition of thinking referred to as the timeless "form" or "essence" of a particular thing, the being-(ness) of a being. Since all nouns in the German language are capitalized, Heidegger did not have at his disposal this graphical option for making this crucial distinction. Nevertheless, he found other ways to indicate the distinction, employing, for example, the archaic German word "*Seyn*" or sometimes even writing the word "*Sein*" and crossing it out. In addition, he did often make use of capital letters in writing the Greek words *Phusis*, *Alêtheia*, and *Logos* (as names for *Sein*), which gives us an important clue. This is not to say, however, that he was always very careful with his use of the word *Sein*; sometimes it marked his fundamental concern and sometimes it was only the indicator of the beingness of metaphysical thinking. Admittedly, one of the difficulties of reading Heidegger is that from text to text – and sometimes even from passage to passage – it is not clear whether he is referring to the *Sein* that is his ownmost concern or to the *Sein* spoken of in the metaphysical tradition.

Even so, he was much more careful and precise with certain specific phrases. In his universe of terms, *Sein selbst* (being itself), *Sein als solches* (being as such), and *Sein als Sein* (being as being) are always used to mark or indicate the fundamental question and the fundamental matter for thought. In the German, as well as in English, these expressions may still invite confusion, however, since, for example, the expression "*Sein als Sein*" also translates Aristotle's inquiry into *on hei on* ("being as being") which became the core topic of metaphysics and was certainly not Heidegger's primary concern. The English-language convention of using the capital B in all these phrases avoids this possible confusion, but at a cost. Although this is certainly not intended by the written convention, some commentators complain that the capitalization disguises the temporal character of being. More recently, some commentators have employed the alternative convention of rendering Heidegger's *Sein* (*Seyn*) with the hyphenated word "be-ing." This word form has its advantages, but it introduces the oddity and awkwardness of writing Heidegger's key terms as "be-ing itself," "be-ing as such," and "be-ing as be-ing." Overall, with the proper qualifications in place, it remains a reasonable option to use the long-standing English-language convention of writing "Being" to mark Heidegger's *Sein*. In this volume as a whole, however, the lower-case b is used throughout.

2   THE AMBIGUITY OF THE WORD "BEING"

On several occasions in his later work (for example, GA8, GA40, GA78), Heidegger brought to light and reflected upon the ambiguity or twofoldness of the Greek participle *on*, or in the older form, *eon*. On the one hand, *on*, "this participle of participles" as he referred to it, may convey the nominal meaning of "a being"; on the other hand, it may be heard in its verbal sense of "to be," the Greek infinitive form *einai*. In all of his discussions of the grammar and etymology of the Greek word *on*, as well as of the German word *Sein*, Heidegger emphasized that the crucial matter is that the inherent ambiguity of this *Ur*-word reveals the fundamental matter for thought itself (*die Sache selbst*), namely, "the ontological difference" between being (that which lets all entities be) and entities (in their beingness) (GA40:56–79/55–78; GA78:37–51, 211–14). The metaphysical tradition of thinking focused its attention on "entities" (*on* in the form of *onta*, entities in their beingness) and lost sight of "being" (*einai*); thereby the primordial "difference" between being and entities was "forgotten."

3 BEING AS *PHUSIS*

A key to understanding Heidegger's transition to his mature understanding of *Sein* after *Being and Time* is his turn in the late 1920s and early 1930s to the ancient Greek notion of *phusis*. His reading of *phusis* as emergence, arising, upsurgence, irruption, manifestation appears to have been crucial in his leaving behind once and for all the Husserlian transcendental-phenomenological manner of framing and characterizing *Sein* and embarking upon his own distinctive ways of approaching the matter of being. For Heidegger – a point that he would make repeatedly over the next four and half decades of his life – what Husserl and the other modern transcendental thinkers had missed was the extraordinary power and vibrancy of the EMERGING of all entities and things. The subjectivism or, perhaps more precisely, the subject-ism of their basic philosophical position had rendered being mute, and Heidegger was deter-mined to allow being "to speak" again. This meant that it was necessary to overcome the transcendental-phenomenological bias that it is the human *logos* that measures out being and to recognize and appreciate once again that being measures out the human being in the first place (for example, GA10:166/111–12; GA55:168–71). In the compelling philosophical narrative that Heidegger began to tell especially in the early 1930s, it was the ancient Greeks and their thinkers – including to some extent Plato and Aristotle – who experienced being as *phusis* as opening and showing and emerging, in effect, "the truthing of *phusis* itself" (*alêtheuein der phusis selbst*, GA73.1:133). The Greeks, he often remarked, dwelled in the midst of manifestness and were open and transparent to the "address" of being, that is, to the "appeal" of being to the human being to cor-respond (*Entsprechung*) in art and word.

Heidegger's great insight into – or at least his signature reading of – the ancient Greek notion of *phusis* informed his understanding of being from the 1930s until his death in 1976. In the 1930s, a major statement is his 1935 *Introduction to Metaphysics* (GA40), arguably his masterwork of the 1930s and philosophically more significant and enduring than his private meditations composed as *Beiträge zur Philosophie (Vom Ereignis)* (1936–38) (GA65). In *Introduction to Metaphysics*, he richly, poetically, evokes the pure "emerging itself" that is *phusis*, and he concludes in no uncertain terms: "*Phusis* is being itself, by virtue of which entities first become and remain observable" (GA40:17/16). Everything, including humans and the gods, emerges from out of *phusis*/being, and this primordial unfolding "includes both 'becoming' as well as 'being[ness]' in the narrower sense of fixed continuity." In other words, *phusis* unfolds entities in such a way that both the movement (becoming) of entities and the abiding and perduring (beingness) of entities may now be seen as but two aspects of the single temporal-spatial way or process. Thus for Heidegger, the age-old metaphysical distinction between "becoming" (potency) and "being" (act, actuality) is "grounded" or "unified" in the onefold that is being itself as *phusis*. This point is subsequently fully unfolded in his statement *On the Essence and Concept of Phusis in Aristotle's Physics B, I*, composed in 1939.

Being as *phusis* is temporal manifestation, but manifestation bears within it – shows up for us – the dimension of withholding or "concealment." According to Heidegger, this is the abiding lesson to be learned from fragment 123 of Heraclitus, *phusis kryptesthai philei*, which is usually translated into English as "nature loves to hide." Over the course of many years and many texts, he employed a variety of translations in order to make the point again and again that manifesta-tion intrinsically includes this dimension of reserve that must be acknowledged and honored by us: "the *kryptesthai* of *phusis* is not to be overcome, not to be stripped from *phusis*" (GA9:301/

230). There is a depth to manifestation – to being as *phusis* – that is never exhausted by our saying, language, meaning, no matter how richly or comprehensively these may be construed. In 1949, he made this point simply: "This truth of being is not exhausted in Dasein" (GA9:373–74/283).

4   BEING AS *ALÊTHEIA*

Also crucial in his transition to his later thinking about being were his ongoing reflections during the 1920s on the ancient Greek notion of *alêtheia* and his progressive realization that, for the Greeks, *alêtheia* was, in the first place, a characterization of being and not of the human *logos*. He found confirmation for this position in his reading of Aristotle's *Metaphysics Theta*, 10 at 1051b. "With this chapter," he remarked, "Aristotle's treatise reaches its proper end; indeed, the whole of Aristotle's philosophy attains its 'highest point'" (GA33:11–12). For Heidegger, *alêtheia* ("truth" understood in an originary and primordial manner) names, first and foremost, the peculiar and proper manifestness of being and not the manifestive activity of the human being, which had been maintained in one way or another in the long tradition of philosophical thinking in the West.

William J. Richardson detected Heidegger's breakthrough to this position in the 1930 lecture "On the Essence of Truth," although others have pointed to several earlier texts. In any case, from the 1930s onward, Heidegger firmly maintained that "*alêtheia* . . . is the fundamental feature of being itself" (GA55:175). This position – that being is *alêtheia* in the first place – is a hallmark of the originality and distinctiveness of his thinking, and especially of his thinking after *Being and Time*. Heidegger observed that thinking about *alêtheia* in this way is too difficult and too "strange" for contemporary philosophy, which by virtue of the most deeply ingrained and stubborn habit of thinking, insists on maintaining that the proper locus of "the truth of being" is the human *logos*. The continuing challenge for thinking is to take up and take to heart that "truth abides in everything that abides" (GA54:242), that "being is *the* truth as such" (GA73.1:133, his italics), and that "truth as self-revealing belongs to being itself" (GA9:301/230). The recurring theme of Heidegger's later work is that being "is" *phusis* "is" *alêtheia*, or put paratactically as he was fond of doing, being: *phusis: alêtheia*: the same (*das Selbe*).

5   BEING AS THE PRIMORDIAL LOGOS

It is arguable that the core of the later Heidegger's thinking concerning being may be found in his lecture courses on the earliest Greek thinkers – Parmenides, Heraclitus, and Anaximander – in the early 1940s. In these lecture courses, he worked out in especially brilliant ways the themes of being as *phusis* (Heraclitus, 1943) and being as *alêtheia* (Parmenides, 1942–43). The motif of being as the primordial *Logos* was brought to fullest expression in his 1944 lecture course on Heraclitus. He is ardent in maintaining that originally the ancient Greek word *logos* did not principally belong to the human being or to any activity or capability of the human being but, rather, to being itself:

> The *logos* of the customarily so-called logic is, as statement and saying, an activity and capability of the human being. This *logos* belongs to the being that the human being is. The *Logos* [Heidegger uses the capital *lambda*, in the same way that he also often wrote *Alêtheia* and *Phusis*] of which Heraclitus speaks is the gathered and the

gathering as the One that unifies everything, and not as any feature within a being. This *Logos* is the primordial gathering that preserves the being as the being that it is. *This Logos is being itself wherein all entities unfold* (my italics). (GA55:278)

Furthermore, he boldly maintains that the primordial *Logos* is "indeed a kind of saying and word" (GA55:259) and also "a kind of speech and voice" (GA55:244), yet, lest there be any confusion, he insists that this *Logos* "is expressly not the voice of a human being" (GA55:244). Being as the *Logos* is the "saying" – "word," "speech," "voice" – as the laying out, opening up, clearing, showing, shining-forth of all that is. Our task as human beings is to hearken to this primordial voice of manifestation and bring forth what is said into our own saying. We cor-respond to the primordial saying, and our cor-respondence (*Ent-sprechung*) is what Heraclitus named *homologein*. His elucidations are dense and difficult, admittedly, but they are not mystifying. They represent Heidegger's original and compelling way of recovering the experience of the manifestness of being that, in his view, had been lost or "forgotten" in the thoroughgoing subjectivism, or subject-ism, of the modern philosophy of consciousness, including Husserl's transcendental phenomenology. His meditations on the primordial *Logos*, along with his readings of *phusis* and *alêtheia* and several other Greek *Ur*-words such as *hen*, *kosmos*, *zōē*, all sought to awaken us to the *experience* of the truth-ing of being.

6   BEING AS THE "GROUND" OF HISTORY

In *Beiträge* and the *Beiträge*-related manuscripts, Heidegger pursues a "beyng-historical thinking," which attempts to think being (as *Seyn*, beyng) as it unfolds or issues forth in the various historical epochs of the thinking of beingness. The "first INCEPTION" among the ancient Greeks glimpsed being as pure giving and granting, and the "other inception," which is breaking in upon human beings in the present time, retrieves the first inception and brings into fresh language the giving, letting, appropriating character of beyng itself, namely, as *Ereignis*.

What is important to emphasize here is that although beyng issues forth in the different historical epochs of the thinking of beingness (*Seiendheit*), beyng itself is not reducible to this history of epochs. That is, beyng is the pure primordial temporal emerging that gives rise to the history of epochs, or to put this another way, beyng is the groundless "ground" of epochal history. In 1941, he states: "The history of being is neither the history of the human being and of humanity, nor the history of the human relation to entities and to being. The history of being is being itself, and only being" (GA6.2:447/EP 82). In his later 1955–56 lecture course "The Principle of Ground," he reprises this theme in terms of the DESTINY or "dispensation" (*Geschick*) of being and maintains that being may be understood as the temporal unfolding and gathering way (Heraclitus' *phusis*, *alêtheia*, *Logos*), but not as any metaphysical first cause, first principle, or sufficient reason. Being is the pure arising that is without "why" and is like a child at "play," as he reads fragment 52 of Heraclitus. Being as (groundless) ground gives rise to world-historical epochs, but is not exhausted by them: "being and ground is not an empty oneness; rather, it is the *concealed fulness* of what first comes to light in the dispensation of being as the history of Western thinking" (GA10:165/110). In "The Saying of Anaximander," he emphasizes the irreducibility of being-as-giving to its historical dispensations, and in so doing, he also sharply diverges from Husserl on the meaning and significance of the term *epoché*:

We may call this clearing holding-itself-back of the truth of being's essencing the *epoché* of being. Yet this word borrowed from the language of the Stoics does not mean, as with Husserl, the methodical bracketing of the thetic act of consciousness in objectifying. The *epoché* of being belongs to being itself. . . . From out of the *epoché* of being comes the epochal essencing of its dispensation, in which proper world history consists. (GA5:337–38/254)

7 BEING AND TIME REDUX

From the outset of his path of thinking, Heidegger was concerned to show the temporal character of being, yet he often admitted that his early efforts, and especially in *Being and Time*, were inadequate. In the Preface to William J. Richardson's book, he observed: "The ekstatic-horizonal TEMPORALITY [of Dasein] delineated in *Being and Time* is not by any means already the most proper attribute of TIME that must be sought in answer to the question of being" (GA11:147/W.J. Richardson 1974, xii). The later Heidegger had a clearer view that the time-character of being is not reducible to the temporality projected by the human being. Being-as-time or being-time is not reducible to "being" as it is constituted by inner time-consciousness – and this shows once again the measure of his distance from Husserl's trans-cendental-phenomenological perspective. Heidegger's later approach was to emphasize how being unfolds the human being and thereby *temporalizes* the human being. Our temporality is what it is only because we are the "there" of being itself that "times."

This later approach is in evidence, for example, in a commentary on Anaximander's fragment in the 1941 lecture course *Basic Concepts* (GA51). Anaximander's *Ur*-word *apeiron* tells us, according to Heidegger's bold reading (107–23), how "being lets entities be." As entities issue forth, they are inclined to perdure in their presence, even to the extent of fixity and permanence; yet there is also at work an overarching counterveiling movement to repel this fixity or "limit" (*peras, Grenze*) and move all entities out of their presence. Being as the *apeiron* – that is, *a-peiron* (the repelling of *peras*, limit) – is the movement or passage that requires of all entities both arrival into – and departure from – their proper presence. In this way, then, "passage" characterizes being itself, or as he also states it, "*being itself is* LINGERING, *presencing*" (121, his italics). And this thus clarifies the relation of being to time as expressed in Anaximander's fragment: being is the temporal allotment of entities. We do not, he claims, attain to an understanding of the genuine character of time by saying "time is . . . ." Rather, we get closer when we say "It is time." *It is time* for the flowers to bloom, the rain to fall, the air to chill. *It is time* that all things, including ourselves, come – and go. We do not allot time; being-time allots to us our time upon the earth and under the sky in the company of all other entities.

8 BEING AS ADAPTATION (EREIGNIS)
AND CLEARING (LICHTUNG)

Heidegger's terms of art, *Ereignis* and *Lichtung*, require more extensive treatment than is possible in this article. Still, it is necessary to address the matter of the relation of these terms to being. In *Beiträge* and the *Beiträge*-related manuscripts, he often states that "*Ereignis* is beyng" or that "beyng is *Ereignis*," and also frequently cites "beyng as *Ereignis*" or "*Ereignis* as beyng." These private manuscripts do not at all suggest that he subordinated being itself/beyng to *Ereignis*. This

is also the case in his later *Ereignis*-writings of the late 1950s and early 1960s. Most notably, in his 1962 lecture "Time and Being" he brings his remarks on *Ereignis* to a conclusion by stating that "the sole aim of this lecture is to bring into view being itself as *Ereignis*" (GA14:26).

Equally explicit are his remarks about *die Lichtung*, "the clearing." In the "Letter on 'Humanism'" (1947), he offers a clarification of his earlier position in *Being and Time* and firmly maintains: "but the clearing itself is being" (GA9:332/253). This statement informs all of his reflections on the clearing in the later work. The human being belongs to the clearing, is "the guardian of the clearing," but is not the whole of the clearing, not the clearing itself (GA89:663). In addition, at one point or another in his later writings, he yokes his other distinctive names for the *Ur*-phenomenon to being itself. Thus, with respect to *Es gibt*, he comments in the "Letter on 'Humanism'" that "the 'it' [*es*] that here 'gives' [*gibt*] is being itself" (GA9:334/255). In the Parmenides lecture course, he italicizes the statement, "*the open is being itself*" (GA54:224). And in the 1944 lecture course on Heraclitus, he reads both the region (*Gegend*) and the expanse (*Weite*) as naming being itself (GA55:337).

9   THE RELATION OF BEING TO THE HUMAN BEING

In the later work, Heidegger more often referred to "the human being" (*der Mensch*) rather than to "Dasein," his word of choice for the essencing of the human being that he employed in *Being and Time* and in the early work generally. One reason for this change appears to be that he had come to understand *Da-sein* in a broader and richer way to refer to the essencing of every being, and not just the human being, from out of being. Consequently, the term "human Dasein" would be more in keeping with the basic themes of the later Heidegger. Nevertheless, in the later work he did occasionally refer back to "Dasein" as the name for the human being, and especially when he was recalling key passages from his early work.

In one sense, the matter here is simple: Heidegger was centrally concerned with the RELA-TIONSHIP (*Bezug, Beziehung*) between being and the human being. This relation is special and even exalted for Heidegger because it is the human being who clears the clearing in a privileged manner; that is, the human being is able to cor-respond to being in LANGUAGE, in ART, and in word. Generally, his reflections circle around this core concern: not being alone, not the human being alone, but the relation between being and the human being. Parmenides' dictum that being (*einai*) and thinking (*noein*) belong together guided Heidegger's thinking from beginning to end.

This much may be clear, yet some of Heidegger's formulations have given rise to confusion. For example, he was fond of stating that "being needs [*braucht*] the human being." But what exactly does this mean? It is certainly doubtful that he intended this as a metaphysical statement to the effect that there is being (emergence, manifestation of all entities and things) *only if* there is the human being. There is no evidence that he was interested in advancing this kind of metaphysical idealism that would hold that the manifestation of everything depends upon the human being. In fact, he was quite clear in the later writings that being does *not* depend upon the human being in this way:

> At times, being needs the essencing of human being, and yet being is never depen-dent upon existing humanity. (GA6.2:441/EP 76)

> The human being for itself has no power over truth, which remains independent of the human being. (GA77:147)

> [Being as] "truth" is "independent" of the human being, since truth means the unfolding of what is true in the sense of unconcealedness. (GA88:205)

> Being and the truth of being is essentially beyond all human beings and every historical humanity. (GA54:249)

We might, then, characterize Heidegger's formulation that being *needs* the human being as "phenomenological." Yet this, too, requires clarification. "Phenomenological" here would not refer to Husserl's particular and strict manner of approaching the matter, but rather, very broadly, to the fact that our access to being is only through our Dasein. In other words, Heidegger wished to focus on the simple givenness that being and the human being happen together: when we speak about being, we are speaking, and when we speak, we are speaking about being. Considered in this broadly phenomenological manner, then, the statement "being needs the human being" is simply his distinctive way of keeping the relation of being and the human being foremost in view.

Nevertheless, it does not follow from this that being is thereby dependent upon the human being and reducible to meaning or sense in a strictly Husserlian transcendental-phenomenological manner. "Need" is not necessarily dependence. In fact, in 1941, Heidegger insisted on being's "pure needlessness" (*reine Unbedürftigkeit*) and clarified being's "independence" from the human being:

> In the scope of the time when being appropriates primordiality in the open and gives to be known and preserved the nobility of its freedom to itself, and consequently, its independence [*Unabhängigkeit*] as well, being needs the reflected radiance of a shining-forth of its essence in the truth. (GA6.2:441/EP 76)

In other words, the unending temporal self-showing and shining-forth of being as *phusis* as *alêtheia* is not in need of the human being in the strict sense, yet we may say that the human being is "needed" only as a mirror reflecting back in language (in the broadest sense) the inexhaustible resplendence of being's manifestation. Thus, being and the human being are correlated, yet being is not dependent on (is independent of) the human being.

To illustrate this point, let us imagine Cézanne standing before Mont Sainte-Victoire and remarking to himself, "The truth of this mountain needs to be painted." The word "needs" of this sentence gets us close to the heart of what Heidegger was seeking to convey. The over-whelming showing, manifestation, shining-forth of the mountain compels the human being to paint – or poetize or sculpt or sing or dance – its truth. The mountain needs the human being, and specifically the human being, in order to show itself precisely *as* a painting or a poem, which properly belong to the domain of the human being. Yet, surely, the truth of the mountain is not exhausted in the painting or the poem. Being as emergence or manifestation is by no means exhausted by our cor-respondence. Cézanne painted Mont Sainte-Victoire over sixty times by some accounts – the mountain needed him to – but not once, let us again imagine, did he think to himself that he had exhausted – or that he ever could exhaust – the manifestation of the mountain. Again, in Heidegger's own words, "this truth of being is not exhausted in Dasein" (GA9:373–74/283).

For the later Heidegger, being is the "ever-emerging" and "ever-living" *kosmos* spoken of by Heraclitus in fragment 30. Over several decades, he took Heraclitus' words very much to heart and emphasized in his elucidations that "no god and no human being has brought forth" being/

kosmos/world, and he called upon us to be ever more open, ever more transparent, to its shining-forth and resplendence. His translation of the fragment well attested to his lifelong meditation on the primacy of being in relation to our Dasein:

> This *kosmos* here, insofar as it is the same for everyone and everything, no one of the gods and also no human being has brought forth; it always already was, and it is and will be: inexhaustibly living fire, flaming up in measures, and in measures going out. (GA15:280/FS 7)

Richard Capobianco

FURTHER READING

Capobianco 2010, Capobianco 2014, Frings 1988, Richardson 1963, Thomson 2005

BEING-HERE (*DASEIN, DA-SEIN*). SEE DASEIN.

23.
BEING-IN-THE-WORLD
(*IN-DER-WELT-SEIN*)

Being-in-the-world is Dasein's essential embeddedness in an environing world. "To Dasein, being in a world is something that belongs essentially" (SZ 13). In defending this proposal, Heidegger sets his face against skeptical worries about the existence of an "external world," and insists that the creature that thinks is – in a way that can appear simply truer to life – also one that interacts with, and acts and moves in, a world around it. Heidegger adopts "the compound expression, 'being-in-the-world'" – *In-der-Welt-sein* – to convey that this relationship with a WORLD is "a fundamental structure in Dasein"; "it is not the case that [Dasein] 'is' and then has, by way of an extra, a relationship-of-being towards the 'world'"; rather "Dasein is never ... free from being-in [*in-sein*]" (SZ 40, 53, 57). Being-in-a-world is what it is for Dasein to be.

"Being-in-the-world" is arguably the fundamental concept in Heidegger's early philosophy. Though it undergoes changes and the expression "being-in-the-world" is less prominent in his later work, the underlying motif is one which Heidegger appears never to abandon. It shapes his understanding of core philosophical topics including TRUTH, VALUE, subjectivity, objectivity, SPACE, and TIME, as well as his understanding of philosophy itself. It is an evocative motif that has also proved hugely influential within European philosophy and beyond, inspiring – to give just one recent example – models of cognition as "enactive" and "extended." But as befits its status, it is also a motif that raises major issues, both philosophically and interpretively, ones which remain the focus of much of the debate around Heidegger's work today.

Let us begin our consideration of this motif with Heidegger's assessment of external world skepticism as a "sham problem" (GA20:218) based upon a confused ontology. Only by "starting with the *construct* of the isolated subject" does one come to wonder how this "fantastically conceived" entity, confined to "its inner 'sphere,'" can come to know a sphere "which is 'other and external'" (SZ 206, 60, italics added). But embracing this Cartesian "construct" leads not only to this skeptical question but also to a deeper though less widely recognized question about the very "subjectivity of the subject" (GA26:194), about the status of the beliefs of this "isolated subject" as made true or false by the holding and non-holding of states of affairs in that "other and external" world. The Cartesian picture leaves us asking – "if thought is something occurring in the subject, in consciousness, or in the soul" – on what basis we find ourselves "measur[ing]" such a "thought" "against the external world": what makes the latter "the standard of measurement" for the former (BH 220)? For Heidegger, since this "'relationship to' belongs to the essence of subjectivity," a "genuine concept of subjectivity is lacking" in the Cartesian picture: "the characteristics of this 'relation between' are omitted," "the very thing to be explained" (GA26:162).

Instead then, Heidegger maintains, we must recognize the "primary kind of being" of the creature that can have beliefs, desires, etc. as that of being "always 'outside' amidst [*bei*] entities which it encounters and which belong to a world already discovered" (SZ 62). The name that

Heidegger offers for that entity – "Dasein" – correspondingly suggests an essential relatedness to, or dependence on, a world, a "there": for this entity to be (*sein*) is for it – to use expressions to which we will return – to be attached, essentially related to, in, or even identifiable with, a there – a *da*. From this perspective, skeptical worries about the existence of a world around us "persist only on the basis of a . . . misunderstanding of the mode of being of the one who raises the question" (GA20:294). But understanding this entity, and getting to the bottom of our Cartesian confusions, is difficult not least because those same confusions prepare us to misunderstand the expressions we have just used – the "there" or "world" that Heidegger declares Dasein is in, and what it is for it to be "in" it.

So, in the grip of such confusions, Dasein's being-in-the-world sounds like an essentially spatial characteristic. But we must resist this thought at least in the form in which we will most naturally construe it, that is, as "the being-OCCURRENT of some corporeal thing (such as a human body) 'in' an entity which is occurrent" (SZ 54). Here we see how Heidegger's critique of Cartesianism stands within a broader critique of the "priority of the occurrent [*Vorhanden*] in traditional ontology" (SZ 147), with the Cartesian's understanding of the challenge of skepticism taking "an ontologically inadequate way of starting" in seeking "a demonstration that two things that are occurrent" – "subject" and "world" – "are necessarily occurrent together" (SZ 147, 205). Although *Dasein* "can with some right and within certain limits be *taken* as merely occurrent" and, within those "certain limits," can be thought of as an occupant of physical space, "to do this, one must completely disregard or just not see the existential state of being-in" (SZ 55). Instead with the "in" of being-in-the-world,

> "in" is derived from "*innan*" – "to reside" [*wohnen*], "*habitare*," "to dwell" [*sich aufhalten*]. "*An*" signifies "I am accustomed," "I am familiar," "I look after something" [*ich bin gewohnt, vertraut mit, ich pflege etwas*].

Regarding this entity, which "I myself am [*bin*],"

> The expression "*bin*" is connected with "*bei*," and so "*ich bin*" means in its turn "I reside" or "dwell amidst" [*ich wohne, halte mich auf bei*] the world, as that which is familiar to me in such and such a way [*als dem so und so Vertrauten*]. (SZ 54)

To say that the "in" of being-in "means primarily *being familiar with* [*vertraut sein mit*]" (GA20:213) might now seem to press upon us a cognitive rather than a spatial construal of being-in-the-world. But here another Cartesian confusion threatens to ensnare us. Just as our schooling in "traditional philosophy" may encourage us to construe "in" as "spatial containment" (GA20:212), so too it may encourage us to construe "familiarity" as already-possessed knowledge. But for Heidegger, "knowing" is "*not . . . a primary* but *a founded way of being-in-the-world*" (GA20:222), one founded precisely in the intimate relation that Heidegger's talk of "dwelling" and use of "*vertraut*" – derived from "*trauen*," to trust, sometimes to marry – aim to convey.

Other motifs to which Heidegger turns in trying to convey this founding intimacy pose similar problems, such as his characterization of Dasein as *sein bei* the entities that populate the world it is "in." *Bei* corresponds roughly to the French *chez* but lacks any straightforward equivalent in English. Heidegger's translators have offered "being-alongside" (Macquarrie and Robinson), "being-involved-with" or "being-in-touch-with" (Kisiel), and "being-familiar-with" or "being-at-home-with" (Sheehan), while Dreyfus has proposed "being-amidst" (1991, xi). In these ways, these readers of Heidegger strive to capture – some more successfully than

others surely – a "basic phenomenon" that is "not resolvable [*auflösbar*]" (GA19:369), and certainly not into the terms in which our philosophical schooling has led us to think.

One way to gain perspective upon these issues – to which we will return – and the different lines of thought that inform the arguably over-determined motif that being-in-the-world is, is to consider how it emerges in Heidegger's work. One such line emerges in his very early reflections on the "environmental experience": the manner in which our experience of an object is always of "something given … from out of an immediate environment," literally an around – or surrounding – world, an *Umwelt* (GA56/57:70, 72). Recognition of this "experience" prompts the further questions, "*How do I live and experience the environmental [das Umweltliche]? How* is it 'given' to me?" (GA56/57:88). If one were to think of the *Umwelt* as "experienced" in much the same fashion as the objects "given from out of" it – as a very large object that includes all these others, perhaps – one might imagine finding or losing the *Umwelt* as we may find or lose objects within it. (This would be one way of envisaging what the Cartesian skeptic fears.) But then, one wonders, how are we given the further space – or "world" – "from out of which" this "super-object" might itself be given (or indeed show up as absent)? What this doomed regress surely shows is that we must reject the picture of our relatedness to the environing world [*Umwelt*] upon which it rests, and this is what Heidegger would have us do. Our "having a world" – we creatures to which objects can be given in experience – can be no "spurious contingency" (GA56/57:88); instead "experience itself has a worldly character" and, as an experiencing creature, "I am as such always attached to the surrounding world" (GA60:13).

This is only the beginning of Heidegger's exploration of the "environmental experience" and I will pick out three features that he identifies. First, in being given "from out of" a surrounding world, objects present themselves as thus-and-so, that is, as understood in definite ways; even grasping an object as an object brings with it such an understanding, as Heidegger argues in his *Habilitationsschrift*:

> Everything that stands "over against" the ego in experience is in some way *comprehended*. The "over against" itself is already a definite *regard* … in which the ego deals with the object. … If there isn't this first moment of clearness … I have no object at all. (GA1:165–66/39–40)

The "environmental experience" is then one of meaningful entities in a meaningful space; rather than experiencing "just … things, objects, which are then conceived as meaning this and that," "the meaningful [*das Bedeutsame*]" – a "*context* of meaningfulness" – "is primary and immediately given to me" (GA58:105, GA56/57:72–73).

Our second feature shows that there is more to be seen in Dasein's being "*caught in meaningfulness*" (GA58:104). The world is not only one which we understand but also one that *matters*, Heidegger introducing another key notion in his early thought when he describes our relationship to the world as one of *care*: "the world is there as always already having been taken up in care in one way or another" (GA62:352/159). Indeed for us creatures to whom objects can be given, "'to live' means to care," because objects "are met with" "on the path of care" (GA61:90, 91); in meeting them, these entities show up as "the with-which of dealings" of ours that are essentially "marked by caring" (GA62:352/159).

Our third – and, for the Cartesian, perhaps the most shocking – feature of Heidegger's account of our relationship to the *Umwelt* emerges from the "many different modes of actualizing itself" that Dasein's "movement of concern displays"; Heidegger's examples are

tinkering with, preparing for, production of, guaranteeing by, making use of, utilizing for, taking possession of, safekeeping of, and forfeiting of. (GA62:353/159)

This finds an echo in a list of "ways of being-in" in *Being and Time*:

having to do with something, producing something, attending to something and looking after it, making use of something, giving something up and letting it go, undertaking, accomplishing, evincing, interrogating, considering, discussing, determining. (SZ 56)

What is immediately striking about these lists is that so many of their members are what one might call "worldly" activities. To use terms we will question in a moment, it is not merely a list of different ways of thinking about entities but also of ways of interacting with them – actually laying hold of them in producing, making use of, and taking possession of them – and Heidegger will insist that such forms of being amidst entities are fundamental ways in which an entity is Dasein. When it "directs itself towards something and grasps it, such an agent does not somehow first get out of an inner sphere in which it has been proximally encapsulated"; rather "its primary kind of being is such that it is always 'outside'" (SZ 62). Losing and letting go of entities – "leaving undone, neglecting, renouncing, [and] taking a rest" (SZ 57) – are also ways of "being 'outside'" in that they are what they are by virtue of the contrasting modes of having possession and laying hold that they require we give up (and of which, Heidegger says, they are "*deficient* modes," SZ 57); and crucially, "interrogating, considering, discussing, [and] determining" – that the Cartesian would identify as "ways of thinking" about entities in *contrast* with "ways of interacting" with them – are also for Heidegger "founded" in our being-amidst entities. Thinking's "measuring itself on entities" is "founded on the fact that, in our intercourse with entities, we have already, as it were, come to an understanding with entities," one through which they are "already disclosed to us" and which is accomplished through our "having dealings with" them (GA26:158).

In characterizing this founding being-amidst, commentators have turned to notions such as "skill," "COPING," "know-how," "body-intentionality," "custom," and "practice." We cannot assess the virtues or vices of these choices here; but we can see how they might aim to capture a vision that has roots in proposals we have encountered above – that experience through which an entity is given "has a worldly character," and that the entity capable of such experience is "always attached to" such a world, a world "immediately given to" it (GA56/57:73). From the perspective these proposals offer, the world "out of which" entities are given cannot be the stranger to the creature to whom they are given that it could seemingly be to the Cartesian subject, their acquaintance a mere contingency. Instead that acquaintance is part of the very fabric of that creature, its grasp of the "external sphere" "immediate" in that, without it, it is not merely ignorant but non-existent. No more can that creature be separated from the world by their belonging to different "internal" and "external spheres" than – in what would be no mere analogy for Heidegger – can its laying hold of an object and the object of which it lays hold. As we have seen, Heidegger turns in these early writings to a variety of images in trying to convey these thoughts: to give one last example, the creature that "cares" "'*is*' its world, the very world it encounters" (GA63:86; cf. SZ 364). But it appears to be in 1923 that he happens upon the image that will dominate his mature early work. In place of earlier talk of our being "always attached to" a world – and of "life [being] in itself world-related" (GA61:86) – Heidegger now insists that "*the being-there of Dasein . . . is being in a world*" (GA63:80):

> World is not something that discloses itself as a supplement to life, or not. Life
> rather means: *being* in a world. (GA62:355/478)

As we saw above, familiar themes from *Being and Time* find expression in these early discussions
(and anticipations) of being-in-the-world. To those themes we can add Heidegger's challenge
to the notion of "'value'-characteristics" ("*wertlichen*" *Beschaffenheiten*) (SZ 100) as a "garb"
given to objects that "are at first present as bare realities . . . so that they do not have to run
around naked" (GA61:91). We also see the more nuanced reflection on what one might think of
as the spatial dimension of being-in-the-world that finds expression in *Being and Time* (Division
1, chapter 3, section c). Heidegger's questioning of the Cartesian mind/body distinction ques-
tions our understanding of mind *and* body and, with them, the associated conception of space
with which Descartes juxtaposes his non-extended mind. We should indeed reject a construal of
being-in-the-world as "being-occurrent . . . 'in' an entity which is occurrent"; but in Dasein's
"authentic mode of 'being' in a world" – that is as "*caring* in the sense of producing, putting in
place, directing ourselves to tasks, taking into possession, preventing, protecting against loss,
etc." – the world "has its distances":

> it is there as: too far, nearby, through this street, through the kitchen, a stone's
> throw, behind the cathedral, and the like. (GA63:102, 101)

It is this "factical spatiality," Heidegger comes to claim, "from out of which and on the basis of
which the space of nature and geometrical space originally arise" (GA63:86).

But this leads us to one of the main controversies about being-in-the-world: the question of
whether its insistence on the intimacy of Dasein and world makes impossible the kind of
objectivity that we typically suppose the natural sciences in particular achieve. This will be
one of two philosophical worries that arise out of the above reflections that we will consider
briefly here.

The discussions I have described above are bound up with reflections on the "origin"
(GA60:59) or "genesis of the theoretical" (GA56/57:88). Developed in the early 1920s through
a more general appropriation of themes from Aristotle – whose work, Heidegger claims,
contains "the central investigation of the human manner of being in the world" (GA17:298) –
these reflections draw on the vision that the *Metaphysics* offers (see A 1 981b23) of science
emerging out of a certain leisure, of humanity "releasing itself from its tendencies to direct itself
to its routine tasks" to instead "*take a break* and *make a sojourn*" (GA62:354/160). Such an
insistence on "objects in the sense of mere things" "emerging" only out of objects being
"originally there for [us] as objects as meaningful [*als bedeutsame*]" (GA62:354/160) finds echoes
in *Being and Time*'s discussion of the "change-over" from dealing with the AVAILABLE to our
coming to observe the OCCURRENT (SZ 357). But how we are to understand this "change-over"
is a difficult question.

One might wonder, for example, whether Heidegger can make sense of Dasein encountering
"mere things" if entities are given "on the path of care"; and when Heidegger characterizes such
a "sojourning" as "in and for the basic movement of those dealings characterized by *concern*"
(GA62:355/161), this may prompt the reaction that many – beginning perhaps with Husserl –
have had to *Being and Time*: that we must argue "against Heidegger" to secure science's status as
not tied to "any necessity of life" but instead as capable of simply "look[ing] at things, and
want[ing] to know things," things with which it need have "nothing to do" (unpublished note of

Husserl's translated and quoted in Moran 2000, 183). From such a perspective, Heidegger's depiction of Dasein as living in a world which it has "always already . . . taken up in care in one way or another" seems to save us from the spectre of Cartesian skepticism, but only by sacrificing our claim to *objective* knowledge, knowledge of the world "conceived of in terms of the objectivity of nature that has been stripped of all meaningfulness [*der bedeutsamkeitsverarmten Gegenständlichkeit der Natur*]" (GA62:355/161), a knowledge stripped of what we might think of as the parochial concerns of a creature "*caught* in meaningfulness."

Though this is not the place to settle such matters, it is noteworthy that, in retrospective comments on *Being and Time*, Heidegger specifically sets his face against such a vision:

> I attempted in *Being and Time* to provide a preliminary characterization of the *phenomenon of world* by interpreting *the way in which we at first and for the most part move about in our everyday world*. There I took my departure from what lies to hand in the everyday realm, from those things that we use and pursue. . . . It never occurred to me, however, to try and claim or prove with this interpretation that the essence of man consists in the fact that he knows how to handle knives and forks or uses the tram. (GA29/30:263; cf. GA9:155/120)

Heidegger did indeed stress in *Being and Time* that, although "looking at the world theoretically" "dim[s] down" "the specific worldhood" of the "available" to "the uniformity of what is purely occurrent," "this uniformity comprises a new abundance of things" (SZ 138); and already in the early discussions sketched above, what Heidegger sees emerge from science's Aristotelian "sojourn" is "an autonomous form of dealings with" the world (GA62:354/160). But to assess whether such a stance is really available to Heidegger, key issues are how we understand the "founding" of scientific knowledge in "being-in" and the sense in which the objects of such knowledge are "stripped of all meaningfulness."

Noticeably, in the early discussions presented above, Heidegger insists that we take "meaningfulness" "as broadly as possible" (GA61:91), proposing at one point that, when "the character of the being-there of this world" is "terminologically designated as *meaningfulness* [*Bedeutsamkeit*]," "'meaningful' means" "being encountered in a definite manner" (GA63:96). If so, and if science were to insist on its objects being "stripped" of "meaningfulness" in this broadest sense, its stance would be a refusal to "encounter [those objects] in a definite manner." From this perspective, "the *demand for observation which is free from standpoints*" is anything but the "express watchword" for the "highest idea of science and objectivity"; instead one can be "free of standpoints only when there is nothing to be done" – no determinate question to be asked – a privilege denied of those who would "actually . . . look at matters and carry out research on them" (GA63:82).

We surely should indeed resist the thought that our thinking is parochial – or otherwise less-than-objective – simply by virtue of being "restricted" to addressing entities "within a definite kind of seeing" of them. To be free of such a "restriction" – in order to glimpse, as we might imagine, the "in-itself" – would seem to be to ask of the world a question that is not "adequately defined," asking how it is – how it is ordered – but with no answer to the prior question, "Ordered with regard to what?" (GA21:284). So one possibility worth exploring is that Heidegger's viewpoint opposes only "an utterly fantastic kind of objectivity," the unattainability of which provides no reason to believe we cannot attain objectivity properly understood: from this perspective, one might well say that "inferring relativism and skeptical historicism from the

fact that an 'in-itself' cannot be found is only the flip-side of the *same* misunderstanding" (GA62:372/171, 372/172).

This sketch of a reading of the "foundedness" of scientific knowledge stresses the first feature of our being-in that we identified above – the "primacy" and "immediate givenness" of "the meaningful"; filling this reading out – by accommodating the second and third – would require it to accommodate the ubiquity of "care" in Dasein's existence and claims such as that "theoretical cognition" is "not without a *praxis* of its own" (SZ 358). Heidegger provides a basis on which one might hope to take such further steps when, for example, he denies that the above ubiquity renders existence "one long woebegone affair": instead "'to live' means to care" and "everywhere" – not just "in unrestrained rapture," but also "in indifference, in stagnation" (GA61:90). But this takes us back to earlier concerns, and on to a second objection that our discussion invites.

We have been told that the "fundamental structure in Dasein" that has been our theme is a "being-in" … but not "in" in the familiar sense of a spatial containment; it is a form of "care" … but a care of the less-than-familiar form that includes "leaving undone, neglecting, renouncing, [and] taking a rest" as modes (even if "*deficient* modes"); and it is a "familiarity" … but not in the familiar sense of a form of knowledge. At each turn, then, we seem to be being told, "'being-in' is *x*, but not – of course! – in the sense of '*x*' with which you are familiar." But what kind of explanation then is that?

We see a striking version of this worry in the 1928 *Metaphysical Foundations of Logic* lectures. Heidegger insists again there that "inasmuch as *Dasein* exists *qua* being-in-the-world, it is already out there with entities"; but he acknowledges that

> even this manner of speaking is still distorted [*schief*] since "already out there" presupposes Dasein is at some point on the inside. Even if I say, Dasein's intentional activity is always already open towards entities and for entities, there is still at bottom the supposition that it was once closed. (GA26:213)

The assertion then that, in contrast with the Cartesian mind that is "closed" and "inside," Dasein is "open" and "out there" threatens to leave Cartesianism's confusions in place, drawing precisely upon them in saying that Dasein is *not* "closed" and *not* "inside." Moreover, Heidegger characteristically criticizes Cartesianism's proposals – and its vision of a "closed" "inside" – as "indeterminate," "indefinite" (SZ 321); if so, statements such as that Dasein "is already out there" will inherit this same flaw, the qualities they characterize Dasein as *lacking* being ones of which we have no determinate grasp. Similar worries apply to other formulations often used in articulating being-in-the-world, such as that Dasein is essentially "engaged," "involved" or – as we saw above – "interacting" with the world. "As opposed to … what?," one must ask. "Thinking about" it? But on whose – but the Cartesian's – conception of "thinking"?

As we saw above, the difficulty here lies at least in part in the fact that, according to Heidegger, the familiar senses of "spatial containment," "care," and "familiarity" to which we naturally turn are not as innocent – and hence perhaps not quite as familiar or as natural – as they may seem. Patterns of thought into which we fall when we hear these terms include patterns of confusion whose influence it is Heidegger's precise concern to expose, thereby attempting to counter "the pertinacity of a sedimented tradition" (GA63:81) into which our philosophical schooling has initiated us. But these confusions linger in the insistence that Dasein is, for example, "out there with entities."

So discussions of being-in-the-world raise important metaphilosophical concerns, ones which are voiced in a number of different ways. For example, because "this structure" "in principle . . . cannot be grasped by the traditional ontological categories," "the issue is one of *seeing* a primordial structure of Dasein's being" (SZ 54–55): "The being-in of Dasein is not to be explained but before all else has to be seen as an inherent kind of being and accepted as such" (GA20:223). Similarly, Heidegger accompanies one of his first uses of the being-in-the-world motif with an insistence that it cannot be explained using familiar notions of "consciousness," or of "subject" and "object": "no modification of this schema would be able to do away with its inappropriateness" (GA63:81). Instead, in an early invocation of an infamously difficult metaphilosophical notion, Heidegger declares that his remark, "*The being-there of Dasein . . . is being in a world*," is a "FORMAL INDICA-TION"; its sense is indeed indeterminate, an "empty intelligibility" that must be "filled out": "Everything depends upon our understanding being guided from out of the indefinite and vague but still intelligible content of th[is] indication onto the right *path of looking*" (GA63:80).

How we are to understand such matters is among many difficult issues that Heidegger's discussions of being-in-the-world raise but which I will not pursue further here, obvious further examples of which include important questions about how we are to understand the very idea of "world." While Heidegger continues to use the motif of being-in-the-world – extensively, for example, in the later Zollikon seminars (see, e.g., GA89:204, 206, 237) – some of Heidegger's more prominent later comments take some of these questions as their theme. For example, Heidegger retrospectively stresses that "reference to 'being-in-the-world' . . . does not assert that the human being is merely a 'worldly' creature," where that is "understood in a Christian sense": "a merely terrestrial being" "turned away from God" (GA9:349/266, 347/264). Here again we struggle with "the pertinacity of a sedimented tradition," in this case turning "world" into "the *Christian saeculum*" and being-in-the-world into a "denial of God" (GA65:295). Such thoughts chime with other important later discussions in which the motif of being-in-the-world clearly has a lingering influence; these include those of "the FOURFOLD": what "we call the world," Heidegger there declares, is the "appropriating mirror-play" of "EARTH and sky, divinities and mortals," and we "mortals *are* in the fourfold by DWELLING [*wohnen*]" (GA7:181, 152/PLT 177, 148). In these discussions, other themes we have discussed resurface, including value, space, the "in-itself" and "the inner": "even when mortals turn 'inwards'," they do so "*without ever abandoning* [their] stay among things" (GA7:152/PLT 157; cf. also 148–52/154–57, and 169/176–77). But it is a consequence of the difficulty of the motif that has been our focus here and around which these themes cluster – combined with its centrality for the profound but difficult thinker that Heidegger is – that here we can take these matters only to the point where the hard interpretive work, that it and they demand, must begin.

Denis McManus

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 12–24, 28–34, 43–44, 69–70; GA20 §§19–25, 31; GA61:85–99; GA62:353–55; GA63 chaps. 2–4

BEING-PRESENT (*VORHANDENHEIT, VORHANDENSEIN*). SEE OCCURRENTNESS.

BEING-THERE (*DASEIN, DA-SEIN*). SEE DASEIN.

24.
BEING-WITH (*MITSEIN*)

BEING-WITH IS the character of DASEIN whereby it is always already structurally related to other Daseins (even when one is alone and others are actually absent). *Mitsein* (literally "being-with") in everyday German simply means "togetherness" or "companionship," but in *Being and Time* Heidegger gives the term a particular philosophical inflection. The everyday, public, cultural world of oneself among others is a "primary phenomenon" for Heidegger. Each one exists in a world saturated with others linked through shared social practices. In *Being and Time*, in §§25–27 and §74 in particular, and also dispersed through his phenomenological writings more generally (1919 to 1929, e.g., the 1925 lectures *History of the Concept of Time: Prolegomena*, GA20 §26), Heidegger uses a number of key terms to name aspects of the a priori structures of human social interrelatedness in an attempt to specify phenomenologically the manner in which human existence involves sharing a common world with others. "Being-with" is the most common term used by Heidegger, but he also speaks of "co-existence" (*Mitdasein*) and, more generally, of "being-with-one-another" (*Miteinandersein*), in an overall "shared or common world" (*Mitwelt*).

For Heidegger, Dasein is essentially BEING-IN-THE-WORLD, but there are other structures that are "EQUIPRIMORDIAL" (SZ 114) or "co-original" (*gleichursprünglich*, GA20:328/238) with it, namely: "being-with" (*Mitsein*), "existence-with" or "co-existence" (*Mitdasein*) and "being-with-one-another" (*Miteinandersein*). In part this co-belonging accounts for Dasein's sense of shared TEMPORALITY and historicity: we belong to a generation and a particular era. Besides "common world" (*Mitwelt*), Heidegger also uses the term "life-world" (*Lebenswelt*) already in his Freiburg lecture courses of 1919–23, around the time Husserl himself begins to use the term (c.1917), so it is not clear who introduced the word *Lebenswelt* into phenomenology.

Heidegger uses the term "co-existence" to characterize the kind of existence that other human beings have alongside and in relation to one's own Dasein. The term *miteinander* is a regular German adverb meaning variously "with one another," "together," "between them," as in such phrases as *miteinander verbunden*, "interconnected," or *miteinander unvergleichbar*, "incomparable." In its noun form, *Miteinander* connotes "cooperation" or "togetherness," but for Heidegger it is a *terminus technicus* to express the a priori existential structure of human being-with-one-another. To say that being-with (*Mitsein*) is a fundamental existentiale of Dasein is to say that Dasein is always in the condition of being-with others even if there are no actual others in one's environment. Human existence is essentially and inherently social and communal. As Heidegger puts it, in *Being and Time* §26, "being-with is an existential constituent of being-in-the-world" (SZ 125). He goes on to say: "so far as Dasein *is* at all, it has being-with-one-another as its kind of being" (SZ 128).

There is a host of other terms employed by Heidegger that have the preposition "with" (*mit* or *bei*), e.g., *Sein-bei*. There is a regular German term, *Beisein*, that means "presence" (e.g., "in the presence of" = *im Beisein des*) but Heidegger reverses it to *Sein-bei* (Kisiel translates this as "being-involved-with," GA20:214), and "being-already-alongside" ("*Schon-sein-bei-der-Welt*," SZ 61) to characterize the manner human beings exist alongside objects in the world. Thus

Heidegger explains that what Husserl characterized as INTENTIONALITY is better understood in term of the "being-involved-with" (*Sein-bei*) of Dasein. The world as such is never there with us in the same sense as other human subjects are; "being-involved-with" has a different structure than the with-world (*Mitwelt*, GA20:333–34).

Heidegger's discussion of "being-with" and "being-with-one-another" generally forms part of a larger discussion aimed at fleshing out the meaning of Dasein's being-in-the-world. In particular, Heidegger seeks to counter the standard metaphysical conception of a human being as an isolated Cartesian thinking self, *cogito ergo sum*. For Heidegger, there is no isolated ego ("a bare subject without a world never 'is' proximally, nor is it ever given," SZ 116); human existence is a priori oriented to others. As he puts it, being-with (*Mitsein*) is co-original with "being-oneself" or "being a self" (*Selbstsein*). Heidegger maintains that one's sense of self is reflected from one's prior engagement with things. One is never given as an isolated "I." In analyzing the "who" of Dasein, Heidegger emphasizes that Dasein is in each case mine, but there is a kind of mineness of everyday Dasein that is really better described as "anyone" and in this sense is already a conduit for a generalized other to be encountered "environmentally" (SZ §26).

Heidegger was already employing the terms "common world" (*Mitwelt*, GA63:93, 98, 102), "co-existence" (*Mitdasein*, GA63:98), and "with one another" (*Miteinander*, GA63:30) in his early Freiburg courses, e.g., Summer Semester 1923, *Ontology – The Hermeneutics of Facticity* (GA63). In his Freiburg lectures, Heidegger distinguishes between "surrounding world" (*Umwelt*), "common world" (*Mitwelt*), and the "self-world" or "world of self" (*Selbstwelt*, GA58:59–64), although the latter term (which still appears in 1925 – I belong to my own "self-world," GA20:333) is not carried forward in *Being and Time*. For Heidegger, the surrounding world consists primarily of "environmental things" (*Umweltdinge*, a term Heidegger probably found in Max Scheler's 1913–16 *Formalism* book) and other people who are encountered practically in relation to one's everyday concerns. I encounter the other person "out of his or her world" (GA20:331). I am with others and they are with me; we are "with-one-another." Others – definite others are encountered when objects are experienced in the surrounding world – are part of an "AVERAGENESS" (*Durchschnittlichkeit*, GA63:99) whereby no one in particular stands out. Dasein, furthermore, lives in a shared present (*Jeweiligkeit*, GA63:30) with others. This social world of others is often anonymously given and is experienced in terms of 'THE ANYONE' (*das Man*). In this experience, I am less myself as I am just anyone, I am one of the gang. Further, the anyone is, for Heidegger, a modality of being-with. We all belong to the *same* shared world that occupies us and engages our solicitude.

This terminology of being-with and being-with-one-another is often thought to be original to Heidegger, but both terms are also found in Husserl's phenomenological writings, especially in the writings of the 1920s or 1930s, and, indeed, Husserl appears to have developed these terms independently from Heidegger, although Husserl does use the term *Mitsein* (e.g., *Husserliana* XXIX, Husserl 1993, 260) in a late text from 1936, which may indicate an influence from Heidegger. Husserl often uses the terms "in each other" (*Ineinander*), "with each other" (*Miteinander*), and "for each other" (*Füreinander*) together to capture the many different ways human beings intentionally interlink, cooperate, enter into conflict, or act on each other's behalf (see the 1925 *Phenomenological Psychology* lectures, where he speaks of the *Ineinander* and *Miteinander* interconnectedness of nature and spirit, *Husserliana* IX, Husserl 1959, 55). Husserl's conception is slightly looser and less technical than Heidegger's. Husserl wants to explore the a priori conditions governing human sociality. Human beings for Husserl are members of

a community, a society, and a social world. There are many layers of community from family through to religious congregations and the state. Heidegger takes over this discussion but situates being-with as an existentiale of Dasein.

In the 1920s and early 1930s, a number of phenomenologists (including Max Scheler, Adolf Reinach, Edith Stein, Gerda Walther, Herbert Marcuse, Alfred Schütz, Aron Gurwitsch, Karl Löwith, among many others), some stimulated by the writings of Marx and especially Max Weber, turned their attention to the a priori structures of sociality and the constitution of the social world. Karl Löwith's habilitation thesis written under Heidegger, entitled "Das Individuum in der Rolle des Mitmenschen" ("The Individual in the Role of Fellow Human Being," Löwith 1928), distinguishes between "world" (*Welt*), "surrounding world" (*Umwelt*), and "shared world" (*Mitwelt*) and devotes a whole chapter to "being with one another" (*Miteinandersein*). Similarly, the Austrian social phenomenologist Alfred Schütz (who had read Husserl independently) offered a detailed exposition of the world of everyday life in his *Der sinnhaften Aufbau der sozialen Welt* (Schütz 1967), where he distinguishes between four dimensions of the life-world, namely, "the world of contemporaries" (*Mitwelt* – Schütz's own translation), "the world of predecessors" (*Vorwelt*), "the surrounding world" (*Umwelt*), and "the world of our successors" (*Folgewelt*). For Schütz, *die Mitwelt*, "the world of our contemporaries," can be primarily impersonal and anonymous and Schütz distinguishes it from the world we have through "face to face encounters." There was, therefore, a strong current of social phenomenology in the contributions published in Husserl's *Jahrbuch* during the 1920s. Nevertheless, Heidegger's being-with remains a groundbreaking and original analysis. Heidegger discusses being-with already in his 1925 *History of the Concept of Time* lectures (GA20) – see especially §26 (an early version of *Being and Time* §26). First and foremost we are in a world with others and we do not distinguish ourselves from these others. Their "existing-with" (*Mitdasein*) character is encountered by us in an inner-worldly way – we encounter others as part of our plans and intentions. For Heidegger, contrary to the philosophical tradition, other humans are never encountered purely as simply there, neither occurrent nor as available; others are experienced as "co-Dasein" (GA20:330) or "Dasein-with" (SZ 114). They have a specific mode of being encountered as "the Dasein of Others" (SZ 118). They are disclosed in a different way than being either mere things or utensils – there is a third modality of being. Heidegger is also clear that "others" here does not mean "everyone else but me" but rather means everyone, including me (SZ 118), in other words, it is the way "we" experience each other. Others have the character of "being there too" (*Auch-dasein*, SZ 118). Indeed, as Heidegger says in his 1925 *History of the Concept of Time* lectures, it is only because of being-with that there can be "being for" or "being against" others (GA20:331). Even avoiding others is a specific form of being-with (GA20 §26). As a constitutive structure of Dasein, it means that even being alone is a form of being-with. The world is a world that includes others as agents, participants, partners; it is an intentional "with-world." This a priori with-character has to be, for Heidegger, the correct theoretical basis for understanding phenomena such as empathy which has been mischaracterized as one person trying to break out of his private consciousness to understand another, essentially inaccessible, consciousness.

As Heidegger elaborates on "being-with" as a fundamental existentiale of Dasein (SZ 118), he asserts that it is not just an empirical fact that humans find themselves in a world with other humans. Human existence has the character of "being-with'" even if there are no others in one's immediate vicinity. I walk by a field that shows itself as belonging to someone, the boat is owned by an acquaintance, Others are encountered in the available world of equipment (SZ §26).

A piece of clothing is made for someone, will fit someone of a certain size. Humans are essentially other-oriented and communal, entangled in one another's project and environments. Being-with is an existential constituent of being-in-the-world.

In the public domain that Heidegger calls "PUBLICNESS" (*die Öffentlichkeit*, SZ 127) we are aware of others in all kinds of way, some closer and some more distant. But there is an implicit leveling down, averaging out, and distantiation involved in this "publicness" (e.g., seats on trains and planes are designed to accommodate average Dasein). The general other is encountered everywhere.

According to Heidegger's analysis, furthermore, the manner in which human beings live and relate to their own existence can be either authentic or inauthentic (see AUTHENTICITY). As Heidegger puts it, "PROXIMALLY AND FOR THE MOST PART" (*zunächst und zumeist*), human existence is absorbed in and fascinated by the world. Furthermore, this kind of inauthentic "absorbed living" (*Dahinleben*), this going with the flow, letting things run on, living for the day (*in der Tag hineinleben*, SZ 370) is a priori condition that makes authentic being possible. Already in 1924 in the "Concept of Time" lecture, Heidegger discusses the anyone and the everyday character of Dasein and says that no-one is himself in everydayness (GA64:113/8). The anyone is always "governed by tradition [*Tradition*]." Being an anyone means being in the public space; one is acting in the dimension of "publicity." Furthermore, the anyone has associated with it a specific state of mind (SZ §34). Heidegger sees everyday being with others as infected with "idle talk" or "gossip" (*Gerede*, SZ §35) and "publicness" (*Öffentlichkeit*). The experience of others more or less sucks the authenticity out of our social encounters. Publicness is a way of existing and discoursing that has a high tolerance for loose, easy generalities. It enables and sustains a kind of "groundless" discourse that closes off the possibility of genuine communication. As Schütz will elaborate, it is possible to be in shared groups that have little to do with one another, e.g., a group of "bystanders" at an accident, a group of "rubberneckers" driving past an accident. The inauthentic everyday common being-with-one-another seems to be primarily a negative experience, although Heidegger himself denies that he is expressing any negative evaluation (SZ 175); rather he is characterizing a really distinct modality of being in the world. Do all forms of being-with lead inevitably to "FALLING" (*Verfallen*) and the anyone? Heidegger is explicit that the self of everydayness is the anyone (SZ §51). Can there be an *authentic* dimension to being-with for Heidegger or is authenticity something associated primarily with an individual Dasein and its decisions? For Heidegger, Dasein in its everyday modality of existing is primarily in flight from itself and from its freedom. Everyday Dasein has a tendency to conceal the world and to elide the difference of others. Heidegger's account of being-with and being-with-one-another has been criticized for its lack of recognition of reciprocal presence and genuine interpersonal experiences, "face-to-face" experiences of the kind discussed by Schütz, Levinas, or Binswanger. This is most obvious in Heidegger's discussion of the possibility of experiencing the death of others (SZ §51) where the anyone dispels and does not allow for anxiety in the face of death (SZ 254). In fact, although this is certainly underplayed in the existential analytic of *Being and Time*, Heidegger does allow for concernful relations with others in solicitude. One can put oneself in the place of the other. As Heidegger puts it, inauthenticity is based on the possibility of authenticity (SZ 259).

Heidegger's discussion of the ontological character of being-with as an essential dimension to human existence as being-in-the-world has had a major influence on twentieth-century philosophers, including Hannah Arendt, Hans Jonas, Herbert Marcuse, Hans-Georg Gadamer,

Emmanuel Levinas, Martin Buber, Jürgen Habermas, and Jean-Luc Nancy. For example, Simone de Beauvoir discusses being-with in *The Second Sex* (1949) and sees that it is a structure that can be concretized as solidarity and friendship or as hostility and enmity. She writes "human reality is at once being-with and separation" (Beauvoir 1953, 79). Some writers have been able to see being-with as offering a possible foundation for a social ethics. Perhaps the great strength of his analysis is in unmasking the absence of authentic or genuine social relations in human social existence. Thus, on Heideggerian grounds, social networks, discussion forums, "friends" on Facebook, and so on, are all forms of *inauthentic* sociality and characterized by averageness, falling, and distantiation.

Dermot Moran

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Mitdasein SZ 114, 120, 121–25
Mitsein SZ §26, 114; 118, 119, 120, 121, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 131, 142, 146, 161, 162, 163, 164, 181, 237, 238, 239, 250, 263, 264, 271, 272, 281, 282, 283, 298, 384, 386
Miteinandersein SZ 121, 122, 124, 125, 126, 127, 129, 130, 138, 161, 162
Öffentlichkeit SZ 127, 128, 138, 167, 169, 175, 188, 189, 190, 192, 252, 254, 257, 271, 370, 397

FURTHER READING

Bauer 2001, Beauvoir 1953, Carman 2005, Dreyfus 1995, Gadamer 2000, Gothlin 2003, Gurwitsch 1979, Löwith 1928, Nancy 2008, Novak 1985, Olafson 1998b, Schatzki 2005, Scheler 1973, Schütz 1967, Theunissen 1984, Zimmerman 1986

BEING-WITH-ONE-ANOTHER (*MITEINANDERSEIN*). SEE BEING-WITH (*MITSEIN*).

BEING-WITHIN-THE-WORLD (*INNERWELTLICHKEIT*). SEE WORLD.

25.
BEINGNESS (*SEIENDHEIT*)

BEINGNESS IS WHAT an entity is as an entity, its "whatness." Beingness (i.e., "the beingness of entities") and "entities in their beingness" is, so Heidegger claims, the fundamental topic of the Western philosophical tradition of thinking in general and of the metaphysical tradition of thinking in particular.

Heidegger often distinguished between the "guiding question" (*Leitfrage*) and the "fundamental question" (*Grundfrage*) of philosophical inquiry (GA88:11–52). The guiding question of Western philosophy was first formally posed by Plato and Aristotle when they asked *ti to on (hei on)*: "what is an entity (as an entity)?" The answer to this question – the timeless "idea" or "form" of an entity – established the principal concern of metaphysical thinking for centuries. The *fundamental* question, which for Heidegger is the question concerning BEING itself (*Sein selbst*) or BEYNG (*Seyn*), was first glancingly brought into view by the earliest Greek thinkers Anaximander, Parmenides, and Heraclitus but eclipsed by the guiding question of Plato and Aristotle and its subsequent elaboration and development in the metaphysical tradition. According to Heidegger, the task for thinking at the end (or completion) of METAPHYSICS and philosophy is to overcome the guiding question in order to pose once again – explicitly – the fundamental question concerning being itself and to bring to light the basic features of being itself.

The matter with respect to Plato and Aristotle is complex, however. On the one hand, these great thinkers narrowed the earliest Greek thinking of being and thereby inaugurated the metaphysical manner of thinking. On the other hand, their thinking retained – or at least echoed – certain features of the originary Greek experience of being. Thus, in Heidegger's view, Plato and Aristotle, as was characteristic of "the Greek human being," dwelled in the midst of the manifestness of entities and were profoundly open to the temporal opening, showing, shining-forth of entities. As Plato contemplated the radiant manifestation of entities, he was particularly (and understandably) fascinated by the "external appearance" (*Aussehen*) of beings as they shine-forth in their fulness. This full "look" of entities Plato named the *eidos* of an entity, the "idea" or "form" of a particular entity, and he was so taken by this *eidos* that he came to understand it as what is most real or "really real" (*ontos on*) about a being. The *eidos*, this lasting, abiding, perduring presence (*beständige Anwesenheit*) of what presents itself, came to define the very "being" of an entity, which became and remained the core concern of the metaphysical tradition of thinking. Even so, Heidegger is careful to point out that Plato's own understanding of the *eidos* or *idea* was rooted in and drawn from his experience of the manifestation of entities:

> We must never allow ourselves to lose sight of the fact that the determinations of *phainesthai* [appearing] and of the [*on hos*] *alethes* [the being as true] are fully presented in the Platonic *eidos*. One is ever tempted to hear *idein* [to look] in *idea*, whereas the outward appearance [*Aussehen*] has priority, the way and manner that the thing shows forth, and not the view that one has of it, a view that one is only able to form on the basis of what the appearance first gives forth. (GA15:333–34/FS 40)

Therefore, in the background of Plato's thinking there remained the originary Greek experience of being as temporal emergence, that is, being as the whole arc of emerging, lingering, and passing away. Yet it was the entity's radiant full look that captured Plato's thinking, and this he enshrined as the *timeless* "form" or "idea" of entities – what Heidegger referred to as the "beingness" of entities. Plato subtly but decisively narrowed the originary Greek experience and thinking of being to the philosophical consideration of the beingness of entities. Furthermore, Plato subtly shifted the focus away from being as the locus of TRUTH (ALÊTHEIA) toward the *logos* of the human being. As Heidegger worked this out especially in "Plato's Doctrine of Truth" (GA9), this shift in thinking gave to the human *logos* and *its* look a far greater prominence and significance. Yet, again, Plato never fully lost sight of the *eidos* as a shining-forth to the human being. It was not until Descartes and the modern tradition of a philosophy of consciousness (including Husserl's transcendental-phenomenological idealism) that the human *logos* was installed as sovereign and supreme and the *eidos* was thought principally in terms of the construction or constitution or intuition (the "looking") of the *logos* of the human being. "The modern interpretation of entities is still further removed from that of the Greeks," Heidegger observed. "The entity does not acquire being in that the human being first looks upon it … rather, the human being is the one who is looked upon by entities" (GA5:88–89/QCT 131).

Heidegger's approach to Aristotle's position is likewise nuanced. Aristotle's thinking, even more so than Plato's, remained in relation to the originary Greek experience of being itself, and Heidegger brings this to the fore especially in his elucidations of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* θ, 10 and *Physics* B, 1 (GA31; GA9). Entities shine-forth their truth, and the fulness of this shining-forth is named by Aristotle in a variety of different ways: *entelecheia, morphê, energeia, phusis, ousia.* Always in the background of Aristotle's thinking, according to Heidegger, is the earlier Greek understanding of being as the temporal emergence of all entities and things, but like Plato, Aristotle subtly narrowed this originary understanding of being to the concern with the lasting and perduring (and ultimately timeless) beingness of entities.

Heidegger's analysis of Aristotle's key term *ousia* is an instructive example of the way Aristotle's thought is guided by a concern with beingness. As we have noted, Aristotle asked the question, what is an entity as an entity? Or, what is an entity insofar as it is? In *Metaphysics Z*, 1 at 1028b3, he answered this question with the term *ousia*, which has traditionally been translated as "substance" or "essence." Heidegger observed that the word *ousia* was not originally a philosophical term: "At the time of Aristotle and even later, the word still retained its ordinary meaning, whereby it signified house and home, holdings, financial means; we [who speak German] also say 'present assets' [*das Anwesen*], 'property,' *what lies before-present*" (GA9:260/199). Aristotle coined this word as a technical philosophical term by focusing upon the meaning of lying-before-present. A being changes in many different ways, but there remains that which is lasting, stable, and perduring – that which remains present through all changes. This abiding presentness of an entity is, for Aristotle, *ousia*, the being of an entity. Yet for Heidegger, *ousia*, the perduring and stable presence of an entity, names more properly the beingness of entities: "This expression 'beingness,' which hardly strikes the ear as elegant, is the only adequate translation for *ousia*" (GA9:260/199). Both Plato and Aristotle, and even more so all subsequent metaphysical thinkers, no longer had in view the being of entities, but only the beingness of entities, which as *eidos, idea, morphê, ousia, substantia, actualitas, quidditas,* or *essentia,* equated the "most real" with permanence, constancy, and timelessness. Accordingly, there was an inherent tendency in all such thinking to arrive ultimately at a divine being of some sort that

is absolute being or "being itself" precisely because it is eternal, immutable, and impassible. Metaphysical thinking, therefore, inclined ineluctably to theology: for example, Aristotle's reasoning to a prime unmoved mover (*Metaphysics* XII, 6–10) and Thomas Aquinas' to God as *ipsum esse subsistens* (subsistent being itself, *Summa Theologiae* I-I, q.8, a.1).

The metaphysical core concern with what underlies or subtends an entity took a different form in modern philosophy, according to Heidegger. For Descartes, the focus turned to the *ego cogito*, the human subject that underlies (*sub-jectum*) all modalities, and this shift in thinking inaugurated the "subject-ism" of modern philosophy. Despite the many differences between modern and ancient-medieval philosophical thinking, what remained the same in Heidegger's perspective was the focus on the beingness of entities and the FORGETFULNESS of the being of entities as first illuminated by Anaximander, Parmenides, and Heraclitus. As Heidegger often noted, and sometimes in a summary manner, all the great modern philosophers ultimately had in view the subsisting entity or principle that determines an entity to be an entity, the beingness of entities: Descartes' *ego cogito*, Spinoza's "substance," Leibniz's "monad," Hegel's "Absolute Spirit," Kant's "transcendental unity of apperception," Schopenhauer's "Will", Nietzsche's "Will to Power," and Husserl's "transcendental ego." In the age of TECHNOLOGY, the beingness of entities is their usablility, orderability, and replaceability, which render all things as mere stock or supplies.

For Heidegger, beingness, in all the different forms that it assumed in the history of Western philosophy, was the answer to the guiding question as it was first posed by Plato and Aristotle. The task for thinking in asking the guiding question is to "go back into the ground of metaphysics" and inquire into the relation of beingness to TIME in order to uncover, recover, and restate the originary and primordial experience and thinking of being (*as* time).

<div align="right">Richard Capobianco</div>

FURTHER READING

Capobianco 2010, Capobianco 2014, Richardson 1963

26.
BETWEEN (*ZWISCHEN*)

"THE BETWEEN" (*das Zwischen*; sometimes also "the in-between," *das Inzwischen* – see e.g., SZ 409) is an openness established within some form of delimitation or boundedness; it is also a differentiating or "differencing" as this occurs within an essential belonging or "sameness." One of several topological terms that are operative throughout Heidegger's thinking, "the between" appears in Heidegger's early work as well as the late thinking. The term is used in many different contexts, but usually carries the same connotations. Although not taken up by Heidegger directly, the idea clearly has a connection back to the Greek *diastema*, meaning "interval," and translatable into German as *Spanne*. "The between" is thus an ontological term that connects directly with "DIFFERENCE" (*Unterscheidung*), including the ontological difference (and Heidegger's later rethinking of that difference), and, in the post-war thinking, with the "dimension" (*Dimension*) and the FOURFOLD (*das Geviert*) – especially in connection with EARTH and sky – and with LANGUAGE (*Sprache*) understood as essentially "relational" (see GA12:198–203/OWL 103–07; Ott 1972 uses the idea of "the between," along with the relational character of language with which it is associated, as a key point of connection between Heidegger and the work of Martin Buber, whose *I and Thou*, which focuses on the interpersonal "between," appeared in 1923). In *Being and Time*, Heidegger explores the being of DASEIN as given "between" birth and DEATH, writing that "as CARE, Dasein is this between" (SZ 374). In *What is a Thing?* Heidegger talks of the openness of experience as "nothing other than the between – between us and the thing" (GA41:244/242). In *Contributions* (in which the between figures prominently and often) "Da-sein is the 'between' between BEYNG and an entity" (GA65:342/240) at the same time as "BEYNG" is itself thought "as the between" (GA65:428/302, 476/335). In "...Poetically Man Dwells..." Heidegger writes of "the between of earth and sky [as] measured out for the DWELLING of man" (GA7:198/PLT 218). Heidegger's various deployments of the idea of the between are indicative of his fundamental commitment to a relational mode of thinking in which subject and object, word and thing, human and world, identity and difference never stand completely apart from one another, but instead belong essentially together. Heidegger's focus on the between makes clear the way in which the elements given in relation (including the elements of the sort of relational pairings just indicated) come into being only in and through their relationality – *only in and through the between*. As the between is a topological notion, so this is also indicative of the topological character of being (see TOPOLOGY). Other topological terms such as "region" (*Gegend*), "BOUNDARY" or "limit" (*Grenze*), "HORIZON" (*Horizont*), "CLEARING" (*Lichtung*), "nearness" (*Nähe*), "the OPEN" (*das Offene*), "PLACE" (*Ort/Ortschaft*), "leeway" (*Spielraum*), and even "ADAPTATION" (*Ereignis*) (which certainly does not stand apart from the topological – see e.g., GA11:45–48/ID 37–38) all implicate some sense of the between even when this implication is not made explicit. The recurrence of the between throughout Heidegger's thinking, and in connection with so many other key terms, thus draws attention to the topological sensibility that informs that thinking almost from the very beginning.

Jeff Malpas

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 108, 132, 233, 373–74, 390, 409; GA5:355/267–68; GA7:153–54, 198–99/PLT 157–58, 218–19; GA10:106–07/60; GA12:22–26/PLT 199–204; GA12:198–203/OWL 103–07; GA13:139, 150; GA41:244/242; GA53:203/166; GA65:13–14/10–11, 22–34/17–25, 62/44, 223/155–56, 243–44/ 172, 263–65/185–86, 311–12/192, 342/240, 428/302, 470–71/331, 476/335, 485–86/341–43

FURTHER READING

Cioflec 2012, Malpas 2012, Ott 1972

27.
BEYNG (*SEYN*)

Beyng is the background against which entities can be uncovered and attain a stable, enduring presence. This background is dynamic and subject to change. In different historical ages it has different styles, each of which invisibly shapes how entities are constituted. "As an origin" or source of entities, Heidegger explains, "beyng is as a RIFT that clears away, a rift within which entities can come to a 'STAND'" (GA66:224). For there to be stable, enduring entities, Heidegger believes, it must be possible to bring relative stability to the chaotic flux or infinite play of the relationships that constitute the world. Rather than positing some primal entity which could fix and establish the definitive relationships that determine all other things, Heidegger argues that the settlement is made possible by a positive absence – like a crack or tear in the rock that lets a climber get a toehold as she ascends a sheer cliff face. Beyng is the positive absence. It is an ABYSS (GA66:92) or a "BETWEEN" (GA65:26) that works by "refusing" to present itself, and by holding back other possible presentations of concrete entities. Through a coherent pattern of such refusal, beyng gives or "allocates" to a world a texture on the basis of which a particular set of defining, constitutive relations becomes salient. "As a refusal, beyng is not a mere withdrawal or deduction but rather the opposite: refusal is the INTIMACY of an allocation" (GA65:240). A "fundamental position on what is as a whole grows out of the authentic and singular beyng, and gains its structure" (GA39:121–22).

The English word "beyng," like its German counterpart "*Seyn*," is an archaic spelling for "BEING" ("*Sein*"). Heidegger began using the archaic spelling in the 1930s to mark off his own preferred, non-metaphysical notion of being from traditional approaches to ontology. When he "now writes being as 'beyng,'" Heidegger notes, "this is supposed to indicate that being is here no longer being thought metaphysically" (GA65:436). The terminological innovation was probably inspired by Hölderlin's use of the now-archaic spelling, which was common in the early eighteenth century. In any event, Heidegger first makes extensive use of the term in his 1934–35 lectures on Hölderlin (see GA39). Heidegger does not always and consistently use this convention to distinguish between his own understanding of being and the metaphysical understandings of being, and many of the published versions of Heidegger's essays and lectures employ "being" even where the original lectures or manuscripts used "beyng" (compare, for example, GA50:8 with GA6.2:235/N3 191; or GA79:69 with GA11:116/QCT 38). After 1950, Heidegger almost never uses the spelling variant, even in his manuscripts, notes, and other unpublished writings.

Perhaps the best way to get an initial sense for how Heidegger understands beyng is to contrast it with his characterization of the metaphysical understanding of being. The metaphysical question of being asks: "what are entities?" But in asking this question, metaphysical thought starts too late: it looks at the way entities have already been constituted as such, and then abstracts out from them their most generic feature to arrive at a concept of being. Beyng, by contrast, is more inceptual (*anfänglicher*) than entities. It is that which first allows entities to manifest themselves as what they are. The question of beyng asks "why *is* what is?" "What is it to

be an entity?" "Against what background can entities appear?" (see GA66:271). When the latter questions are replaced by the metaphysical "what is" question – an event that occurs at the first dawn of Western philosophy – this is already a sign of the ABANDONMENT of being and oblivion of being.

In metaphysical accounts, being is thought of in two different ways – either as the "highest cause" that produces everything else, or as the most general and universal category that everything falls under – the "essential" property of objectness (GA65:229; see METAPHYSICS). Heidegger picturesquely describes these two approaches as interpreting being either as "a varnish" or as "a slave driver" (GA66:204). That is, being is either an inert overlay on the entities that are, or it causes them to be what they are. Beyng, by contrast, is neither a cause nor a category, and it can't be discovered by investigating the properties of entities: "beyng never leaves a trace in entities . . . is never to be found as an entity among entities" (GA66:202). But the overall style of a world can indicate the structure of beyng, and Heidegger views the development of a sensibility for this style to be one of the pre-eminent tasks for philosophy.

To fully understand the contrasts Heidegger draws between being and beyng, we need to bear in mind that Heidegger's ontology is strongly relational – that is, what something *is* is a function of how it relates to other entities. The relations that are most salient to us produce for us a network of intelligibility. Entities appear at the stable nodes of this network of relationships. That certain relations stand out as definitive and essential, while others recede in importance, is a function of the "in-between," that is, the CLEARING traversed by the relations that unite entities to each other so that they can mutually define each other. Beyng is that "in-between," the "essential, abyssal ground of the in-between" (GA69:116) that sustains and structures relations. One is tempted to think of the background that allows entities to show up in the foreground as having a kind of "texture," the friction of which erases some possible relations while making others stand out. Or perhaps one can think of beyng as creating a kind of gravitational warp to the field of possible relationships – a warp lets some relationships stand out as salient because others disappear into the gaps or folds of the field. Thus, even though beyng is not an entity and makes no concrete appearance in the world, it is not an inert nothing, an "indeterminate emptiness into which something 'appears'" (GA69:123). It is finite and rich because it is a particular texturing of the field, and thus allows very specific relationships to emerge as definitive of entities in the world. Since a different, singular beyng underlies being in different eras or epochs (see EPOCHÉ), the essence of entities is determined according to a different style. Thus, beyng is responsible for "essencing" (*Wesung*): "entities are, beyng essences" (*das Seiende ist, das Seyn west*, GA65:30; see also GA45:2; GA65:7, 29, 74, 260, 263, 267, 286, 368, 389, 470, 472–73, 476; GA66:66, 84, 92, 274, 350; GA70:127; GA75:317).

An understanding of being, Heidegger notes, is "the unavoidable foreground of the truth of beyng" (GA66:208) that operates in the background. Being-with-an-i is the terminal product of a particular beyng having allowed a particular world to coalesce and stabilize and rigidify: "beyng hardens into being in the form of BEINGNESS" (GA66:203). Having thus hardened, being shows up as static, timeless, and vacuously empty because it is predicable of everything that is. Beyng, by contrast, "is the most finite and richest, the most abyssal" (GA65:240), and it is dynamic and historical in nature. Because beyng is finite – that is, it is particular to a particular world or historical epoch – it is subject to change. Indeed, Heidegger argues that the history of different understandings of being is really a history of changes in the abyss or rift-design or

background texture that is beyng. We humans play a role in this transition from one world to the next by becoming adapted or attuned to a new background (see ADAPTATION). Beyng involves an "allocation" of entities, and this "allocation is the attuning determination [*Be-stimmung*], the throw that throws the human being into a fundamental attunement" (GA66:224).

Nevertheless, beyng is operative without necessarily ever being recognized as such. Indeed, Heidegger argues that for most of the history of metaphysics, thinkers have been oblivious to beyng. In fact, he goes so far as to argue that beyng is not dependent on us, and certainly not a product of or category of human representation (GA70:30).

Mark A. Wrathall

28.
BLACK NOTEBOOKS, THE (*DIE SCHWARZEN HEFTE*)

T HE BLACK NOTEBOOKS are a set of notebooks that Heidegger maintained from 1931 to 1970. The first of these notebooks, written between 1931 and 1948 and titled *Considerations II–XV* and *Remarks I–V*, were published in 2013 and 2014 in the *Gesamtausgabe* (GA94–GA97). The other volumes of the *Black Notebooks* will be published in the near future.

The now published volumes *Considerations II–XV* and *Remarks I–V* (henceforth referred to as *Notebooks*) are neither private diaries nor theoretical sketch-books. Instead, in the *Notebooks* Heidegger undertakes to shape and document the philosophical persona of the *thinker* Martin Heidegger, the acclaimed author of *Being and Time*, on the world-historical stage, positioning his own developing thought and its historical significance in conjunction and critical exchange with ongoing world-historical events. Having made the SENSE of BEING central to philosophy in *Being and Time*, in the *Notebooks* Heidegger attempts to present his insight into "what really *is*" (GA97:137; see also 233), which is somewhat reminiscent of his Bremen lectures from 1949, entitled *Insight Into That Which Is* (GA79:3–81).

The *Notebooks* belong to the period after *Being and Time* when Heidegger abandoned the "ontological" for an onto-historical approach (GA94:19, 93; see ONTOLOGY and HISTORY OF BEING). *Considerations II* and *III*, written between October 1931 and 1934, put forward that the one and only task of philosophy or, rather, THINKING, was the "enabling of being" (*Ermächtigung des Seins*, GA94:39) or even the "triggering" of "being" by articulating it *anew* and *more originarily* than in the tradition (GA94:29, 27). As the *Notebooks* show, Heidegger's welcoming of Hitler and National Socialism in 1933 (GA94:100–42) is predicated on the assumption that these political changes would help "enable" being to come to the fore again. In the *Notebooks* Heidegger never questioned that this "task" especially involved the German PEOPLE (GA94:27, 66; GA97:47).

However, Heidegger did give up this activist and political accentuation of thought beginning with *Considerations IV*, written after his growing disaffection with National Socialism and his resignation from his Rectorate of Freiburg University in April 1934. From about the same time Heidegger argued that ART, in particular poetry (especially Hölderlin), was the means – "equiprimordial with thought" – to articulate being or the WORLD: "World is comprehensible only through art as the original *Ereignis*; not merely through knowing (thinking) alone, nor through action (deed)" (GA94:216). Moreover, Heidegger began to envisage not a retrieval or reestablishment of being, first articulated in Greek philosophy, but a "second INCEPTION" or "other inception" altogether, an ADAPTATION or event (*Ereignis*) incomparable to the first, metaphysical beginning in ancient Greece (GA94:209, 213, 249, 314, 323, 429; GA96:3).

For Heidegger, this non-metaphysical and second inception requires a radical separation of being (spelled variously as *Sein*, or *Seyn* – see BEYNG) from entities or the realm of entities

(*Seiendem*), in order to understand being from out of itself, and "not in opposition to entities," or as a mere afterthought and addendum, or ground to entities (GA95:42). Heidegger argues that since the Renaissance and modernity the realm of entities has become more and more prominent, directing all efforts toward making and managing entities. He calls this MACHINATION (*Machenschaft*). It consists in the ever increasing emphasis on planning, ordering, manufacturing, and manipulation of entities for human purposes – guided by modern philosophy (in particularly Cartesianism), and brought about by modern SCIENCE and TECHNOLOGY (where nature is reduced to a mere resource for making things) on the one hand, and the historical sciences (where history features as a resource for managing culture and the beliefs of people through education, entertainment, and propaganda) on the other hand (GA96:211, 394; GA95:3; GA94:196, 394; GA97:237). The ultimate ground of machination lies in the subjectivism and representationalism that has defined metaphysics since antiquity (GA95:244).

Since machination leads to an oppressive and alienating "domination of entities" (*Herrschaft des Seienden*, GA95:211, also 236), resulting in "the FORGETFULNESS of being" (GA95:248, 211, 236), Heidegger critiques machination in all shapes and forms, and the bulk of the *Notebooks* revolves around this theme. Throughout the *Notebooks* Heidegger repeatedly critiques and rejects modern ideologies such as Communism, Fascism, Liberalism, Americanism, Internationalism or Planetary Politics, as well as the GIGANTIC mobilization for the war machinery built up during World War II, because, in one way or another, they all center on scientific-technological and bureaucratic calculation, organization, planning, production, and distribution of entities – in the service of the principle of subjectivity, be that the state, the people, the party, the collective, or the individual. Heidegger also implicates Christianity and Judaism in machination, using offensive anti-Semitic language (GA95:97; GA96:46/47, GA97:20). This aspect dominated the initial reception of the *Notebooks*.

In the *Notebooks* Heidegger argues that what is occluded by machinations with entities is thinking and what is its sole and proper theme: being in itself. But the *Notebooks* do nowhere provide a full and comprehensive treatment of being, which Heidegger clearly reserves for other major works of this period, such as the *Beiträge zur Philosophie (Vom Ereignis)* (GA65), *Besinnung* (GA66), *Die Geschichte des Seyns* (GA69), and other works. Nevertheless, Heidegger's turn to LANGUAGE is quite conspicuous in the *Notebooks* where he writes: "being (*Sein*) [is] not without language (*Sprache*) – but precisely because of that not 'logical.' Language [is] not without being (*Sein*)" (GA94:11). Since "the word belongs to the essence of being itself" (GA95:288), Heidegger can claim that "man can take being at its word only because it is word in itself" (GA95:307).

Heidegger also asserts that being (*Seyn*) is neither an object and thus not explicable or to be mastered by recourse to something else, nor is it "effective" (GA95:290/291), or beholden to a "goal" or aim (*Ziel*) (GA95:147/48, 156). Furthermore, being is "tragic" because it begins as an "ABYSS" (*Abgrund*) (GA95:417). "Nothingness" belongs to "being," or "nothingness is 'equiprimordial' with being (*Seyn*)" (GA95:279; see NOTHING). In line with this, Heidegger emphasizes that being is "uncanny" (GA95:291). But he also claims that "beyng" (*Seyn*) bears, however "unthinkable to thought," "that which is wholesome" (*das Heile*) (GA97:89). Moreover, Heidegger asserts that "beyng (*Seyn*) is the ether in which man breathes, without which he becomes livestock (*Vieh*), falling even below it, demeaning all that he does as breeding of livestock (*Viehzüchtung*)" (GA94:232). Hence Heidegger claims that "the TRUTH of being (*Wahrheit des Seyns*) is the ground of history (*Geschichte*)" (GA96:79). But he does not specify

how the comprehension of being will transform the world, although he clearly suggests that the recognition of being will put an end to machination.

Already in the *Notebooks* Heidegger holds that philosophy has been so completely coopted into the system of machinations that it cannot open up access to being. Therefore he argues that "we must philosophize our way out of philosophy" (GA94:20), or "abandon philosophy" altogether (GA97:276), in order to begin, "at the end of philosophy," the path of "thinking" instead (GA97:236). This reference to thinking or thought in an emphatic sense, in its contrast to philosophy, anticipates Heidegger's later position, formulated for instance in his essay "The End of Philosophy and the Task of Thinking" (GA14:67–90).

Ingo Farin

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA14:67–90; GA65; GA66; GA69; GA79:3–81; GA94; GA95; GA96; GA97

FURTHER READING

Di Cesare 2015, Farin and Malpas 2016, Gander and Striet 2017, Heinz and Keller 2016, Herrmann and Alfieri 2017, Krell 2015, Mitchell and Trawny 2017, Trawny 2014, Vietta 2015

BODILY PRESENCE (*LEIBHAFTIGKEIT*). SEE LIVED BODY.

BODY (*LEIB*). SEE LIVED BODY.

29.
BOREDOM (*LANGEWEILE*)

Boredom, in its most profound form, is a fundamental mood (*Grundstimmung*) in which the passing of time is missing, entities lose their significance, and one becomes indifferent to everyone and everything. Such profound boredom is a fundamental mood because it is a way of finding oneself in, and disclosing to oneself the world that is a condition for the possibility of metaphysical thinking. The German term translated as "boredom" – *Langeweile* – literally means "long while," which points to the common experience that when we are bored, time becomes long and drawn out. The temporality of boredom is essential to Heidegger's phenomenological analysis of it. Already in his 1924 lecture course *The Concept of Time*, Heidegger raises the possibility of understanding boredom in terms of the lengthening of Time (GA64:19–22). His most extensive discussion of the term occurs in his 1929–30 lecture course *Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics* (GA29/30). In what follows, I summarize Heidegger's treatment of boredom found there.

Heidegger's account of boredom is a preparation for his metaphysical questioning of world, finitude, and solitude, which are the three "fundamental concepts of metaphysics" alluded to in the title of the course. According to Heidegger, there are three forms of boredom: (1) becoming bored by something (*Gelangweiltwerden von etwas*); (2) being bored with something (*Sichlangweilen bei etwas*); and (3) profound boredom (*tiefe Langeweile*), which is expressed by the impersonal phrase "it is boring for one" (*es ist einem langweilig*). Within this third form of boredom, Heidegger makes a distinction between "profound boredom" and "contemporary boredom" but he doesn't flesh it out systematically or with much clarity (see Withy 2013). Each form of boredom manifests in relation to how time passes (*die Zeit vertreiben*). Within each of the three forms of boredom there are two related structural moments: being left empty (*Leergelassenheit*) and being held in limbo (*Hingehaltenheit*). Only by understanding how each form of boredom relates to the passing of time and what role each of the two structural moments play can we fully grasp what boredom is for Heidegger.

I BECOMING BORED BY SOMETHING

The first form of boredom is the most familiar but also, according to Heidegger, the most superficial. You experience this form of boredom when you are bored *by* something, be it a person, object, or state of affairs. Boredom is unpleasant and thus, you try to drive it away. Heidegger offers an example of this form of boredom. Imagine yourself at a train station in the middle of nowhere waiting for a train that won't arrive for hours. You have a book, but it doesn't interest you. In an attempt to pass time, you read the train schedule, count trees, draw figures in the sand, but all to no avail. You can't help but be bored. In terms of the two structural moments of boredom, you are held in limbo by what you intend to do, namely, catch the train that isn't coming, and you are left empty in that you aren't fulfilled by anything. In sum, in the

first kind of boredom, the object, person, event, or place with which you are engaged fails to be fulfilling or to keep your attention.

2   BEING BORED WITH SOMETHING

The second form of boredom is slightly more complicated than the first. Whereas with the first, what is boring is clear to the person experiencing boredom (i.e., the object of boredom), with the second, what is boring isn't immediately clear. To elucidate this form of boredom, Heidegger provides the example of a dinner party that you attend where neither the company, the conversation, the food, nor the ambience are themselves boring. And yet, after returning home, you realize that the whole evening was boring. No determinate object or part of the evening bored you, rather, boredom arose from an indeterminate "I know not what." What you are bored with, Heidegger maintains, is the passing of time itself and insofar as this is the case, boredom and the passing of time become intertwined.

Understanding the structural moment of being held in limbo requires us to backtrack. Note that with regard to the evening, you freely chose to attend the dinner party by leaving yourself time and taking this time for yourself. But at the party, this time that you gave to yourself comes to stand still in a standing now (*stehendes Jetzt*). According to Heidegger, you become stuck in this standing present or "stretched now" (GA29/30:188–89), cut off from the sequence of nows and the significance of the full temporal horizon. Being held in limbo in this more originary way is being stuck in the standing now, which is another way of saying that you aren't pursuing your authentic projects. With regard to the structural moment of being left empty, the emptiness isn't directly caused by something in the surrounding, but rather arises as a result of having left your authentic self behind (*Sichzurücklassen*). Unlike the first form, here, boredom also comes from you and not just from the situation. But the fact that boredom comes from you is both inconspicuous and concealed. This second form of boredom is more profound than the first since one's whole situation is boring and not just an object or person within it.

3   PROFOUND BOREDOM

Whereas in the first form of boredom, a determinate object or situation is the source of our boredom; and in the second form, boredom arises both from the particular situation in which we find ourselves and from ourselves; in the third and deepest form of boredom, there is nothing in particular that is boring, nor is there a determinate cause or reason that we are bored. And yet, everything bores us, including ourselves. Heidegger expresses the ubiquity of profound boredom in the impersonal construction "it is boring for one" – where "it" is the same subject found in expressions such as "it is raining" or "it is hot." In this form of boredom, Dasein becomes an "undifferentiated no one" (GA29/30:203).

In this unconditioned, overpowering, extreme form of boredom the passing of time is altogether missing. All three temporal dimensions (past, present, and future) merge into a unified temporality and entities as a whole withdraw. That is, they lose significance for oneself and one grows indifferent to what one was, is, and what one will be. And yet, one doesn't respond to this boredom by trying to distract oneself from it; rather, one is anesthetized, held in

boredom's grip. One wants nothing from particular entities in contingent situations; one is entirely indifferent to everything and everyone.

On account of the fact that one is unable to become involved in anything, profound boredom leaves one empty. On account of the fact that one's possibilities are foreclosed, profound boredom holds one in limbo. And yet, these two structural moments don't lead to despair. Rather, in profound boredom, Dasein's own unexploited possibilities are disclosed to it. As such, profound boredom drives Dasein to enact its ownmost possibilities in the instant or "MOMENT of vision" (*Augenblick*) in which Dasein faces itself as the kind of being it is. That is, in profound boredom Dasein becomes authentic. In sum, the revelatory moment of profound boredom is Dasein's being called toward its authentic self-disclosure wherein it is brought face to face with itself and its temporal FREEDOM.

In terms of the relationship between the three forms of boredom, it's not the case that the first leads to the second and the second to the third. In fact, they don't stand in any causal relation to one another at all; rather, the third form of boredom is the condition for the possibility of the first and second. It is only because the constant possibility of "it is boring for one" lingers in the ground of Dasein that anyone can become bored by things and people around them.

Heidegger's claim is that every act of philosophizing develops out of a *Grundstimmung*. Thus, in order to philosophize in an authentic manner, our primary task is to awaken in ourselves this basic mood so that we may open up the way to inquire into the essence of metaphysics and its fundamental questions.

Lauren Freeman

FURTHER READING

The following articles are some of the most helpful and interesting accounts of boredom in the secondary literature.

1. De Beistegui (2000) provides one of the best historical accounts that links Heidegger's thinking about boredom from the late 1920s to his thinking about it from the 1930s.
2. Freeman and Elpidorou (2019) undertake a study of the nature of profound boredom with the aim of investigating its place within contemporary psychological and philosophical research on boredom.
3. Freeman and Elpidorou (2015) discuss the basic mood of boredom, provide an account of its ontological significance, and consider how Heidegger's notion of mood changes in his later thinking.
4. Slaby (2010) raises a serious problem with Heidegger's account of profound boredom. Although Heidegger's goal is to make the case for the possibility of the connection between profound boredom and a call to authenticity, Slaby contends that Heidegger's interpretation seems forced, especially since it is equally plausible that one could willfully submit to the complete indifference of profound boredom as opposed to undergoing a fundamental self-transformation.
5. Stafford and Torres Gregory (2006) discuss how Heidegger's account of boredom can be related to discussions of boredom in cognitive science.

6. Withy (2013) provides a novel reading of GA29/30, including Heidegger's account of boredom. She argues that the goal of the text – namely, to awaken in us profound boredom – is accomplished not in the phenomenological analysis of it, but rather in the comparative analysis of human and animal. Her account gives compelling reasons as to why the two analyses are paired, namely, to work together to lead us toward authenticity, which serves a therapeutic goal.

30.
BOUNDARY (*GRENZE*)

A BOUNDARY IS THAT within and from which something appears or is disclosed. As Heidegger writes in "Building Dwelling Thinking," "a boundary is not that at which something stops but … that from which something begins its presencing" (GA7:157–58/PLT 154). A boundary is thus originary and enabling rather than merely restrictive. Although the explicit characterization of boundary in this way tends to be more common in Heidegger's later thinking, it nevertheless seems to be implicit throughout Heidegger's work – most obviously, perhaps, in the understanding of DEATH as determinative of the being of DASEIN in *Being and Time*, and, connected to this, in his use of the notion of "HORIZON." Heidegger attributes this originary sense of boundary to "the Greeks," connecting it to the Greek *peras* (and also, in the passage at GA7:157–58/PLT 154, to *horismos*), but it is also clearly at work, not only in Husserl's original use of "horizon," but also in Kant's critical philosophy, especially the *Critique of Pure Reason*, where the task of establishing the grounds of knowledge or EXPERIENCE turns out to be identical with establishing their proper bounds (see GA41:122–23/120–21: here Heidegger, in explicating Kant, contrasts a "laying of limits that demarcates against" with a "delimiting in the sense of an exhibition of the inner construction of pure reason"). See also PLACE, BETWEEN.

Jeff Malpas

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA5:71/53; GA7:157–58/PLT 154; GA9:269/206; GA10:125–26/72; GA41:122–23/120–21; GA54:121/82

FURTHER READING

Malpas 2012

BRINGING CLOSE BY (*NÄHERUNG*). SEE CLOSENESS.

31.
BUILDING (*BAUEN*)

T o build is to erect a dwelling place. Heidegger sometimes uses "building" in a metaphorical sense, as in "thinking builds upon the house of being" (GA9:358/ 272), but his principal use is literal. Following German etymology, he divides literal "building" into "constructing" and "cultivating" (GA7:149/PLT 145). (*Weinbau* is viticulture, a *Bauer* is a farmer.) Sometimes he treats any kind of "constructing" as "building" – he mentions "ship-building" (*Schiffsbau*, *ibid*.) – but his focus is on building that consists in the "erecting" of buildings. "Building Dwelling Thinking," the locus of this discussion, has been compulsory reading in many architecture schools ever since its publication in 1954.

"To build," Heidegger writes, is "already to dwell," to be, that is, "at home" in a place rather than merely to "live" there. This is something "told" to us by language: *bauen*, "to build," is descended from the Old High German *buan* which means "to dwell" (GA7:148/PLT 144; the English word has a similar etymology). Obviously Heidegger does not mean that only those who "dwell" in a place can erect buildings there. What he means is that only dwellers can erect "*authentic* building[s]" (GA7:206/PLT 225, my emphasis), building in its *original* sense.

Dwelling, as Hölderlin tells us, is always "poetic." It is a matter of one's natural and human environment showing up in a poetic light a precious "gift" for which one experiences deep "gratitude": of its showing up, not in the prosaic terms of scientific or technological description, but rather as "the fourfold" of "earth" and "sky," "divinities" and "mortals." Authentic building is a matter of "caring-for" (*schonen*) the gift of the fourfold, of "keeping it safe" (*verwahren*) in one's building (GA7:153/PLT 149).[1]

Heidegger's paradigm of an authentic building is the bridge that swings "with ease and power" over the river (GA7:154/PLT 150). The quotation is from Hölderlin's ode to Heidelberg, one of his "dearest towns," and so the reference is specific to the so-called Old Bridge of Heidelberg. The bridge cares-for the elements of the fourfold through both protection and completion. It cares, for instance, for mortals by allowing them their passage from bank to bank, and it cares for the Neckar by, unlike, say, a hydro-electric dam, allowing it to remain a river. But it also completes, "brings forth," the fourfold by "gather[ing] the earth as landscape around the river": it is only the bridge that unifies the two "edges" of the river by allowing them to come forth as "banks" (GA7:154/PLT 150).

In contrast to the authentic bridge's sensitive response to its particular site, "the Autobahn bridge" – Heidegger's paradigm of an inauthentic building – is "tied into the network of long-distance traffic, [and is] located as calculated for maximum speed" (GA7:155/PLT 150).[2] Apart from special engineering problems it might present, the Autobahn bridge has no concern for its site as such, since its imperatives are entirely "long-distance."

---

[1] Here, and in other places, I have made adjustments to the translation cited.
[2] There is a bad mistranslation of this passage in PLT – the freeway bridge is allegedly "paced for maximum yield" – the unintelligibility of which makes it easy to miss the fact that the freeway bridge is the paradigm of *inauthentic* building.

Writing amidst the "housing shortage" caused by the Second World War's reduction of the German cities to rubble, Heidegger is distressed by the mechanized modernism of the apartment buildings being thrown up in great haste. "Cheap, light, and airy" though they are, he doubts that they are products of, or, therefore, that they can promote, dwelling (GA7:147/PLT 144). More specifically, "Building Dwelling Thinking" is a critique of the "International Style," a style that took Le Corbusier's 1926 slogan, "a house is a machine for living in," as its motto. The International Style is "international" precisely because the machine is international, essentially the same wherever it is located. Heidegger's Autobahn bridge, it seems to me, is intended as a paradigm of the International Style. Because its concerns are entirely "long-distance" – "international" – it is almost certainly a violation of its site. This makes it a paradigm, too, of the "INVENTORY" or SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT(ION)ING (*Ge-Stell*) that underlies modern technological practice in general and makes it a violation of nature, both non-human and human.

Buildings may be either public or domestic. Heidegger's paradigm of the authentic domestic building is the traditional Black Forest farmhouse. With its long, sloping roof nestling into the side of the hill, it preserves the contour of the hill while, in winter, gathering insulating snow into the resulting V. (Speaking of his "organic architecture," Frank Lloyd Wright said that a house should not be "on a hill," not, indeed, "on" anything at all, but rather "of the hill.") The altar niche in the corner of a room cares for both gods and mortals by gathering the gods into the house, while the place for the coffin cares for mortals by reminding them of the finitude of their "journey through time" (GA7:162/PLT 157–58).

In that authentic buildings "gather" the four elements of the fourfold into a focal presencing, Heidegger calls them THINGS, in the ancient sense in which a "thing" was, as he reminds us, a "gathering or assembly" (GA7:155–56/PLT 151). (Heidelberg has its own *Thingstätte*, a kind of amphitheatre which was used, inter alia, to hold Nazi rallies.) So all authentic buildings, domestic as well as public, are things in that they gather the fourfold. Heidegger's main interest in buildings as things is, however, focused on public – and, as one might be tempted to call them, "iconic" – buildings, of which the Heidelberg bridge is once again the paradigm.

What makes a building such as the bridge especially important is that, as a "PLACE" (*Ort*), it provides a "SITE" (*Stätte*) for the fourfold. Only buildings that are places can do this (GA7:156/PLT 151). By a "site" Heidegger says he means a "space cleared for settlement and lodging" (GA7:156/PLT 152), that is, a dwelling space. (Since *Stätte* connotes historical significance – as in "world heritage site" – he means the dwelling space "of an historical community.") The Heidelberg bridge does this by becoming a center in relation to which a boundary to the dwelling space is created. Such a boundary is essential to a dwelling space, for "a boundary is not where something stops but … that from which it begins its presencing" (*ibid.*). Within this bounded dwelling space the bridge allows further "places" (*Plätze*) that are organized according to how near to, or far from, the bridge they are (GA7:157/PLT 153).

Heidegger claims that only something that is itself a "place" (that is salient or "iconic") can clear a dwelling space. Before the bridge there were many "positions" (*Stellen*) along the river (this concept belongs to geometric space rather than dwelling space, GA7:157/PLT 153) but no places: "a place comes into being only in virtue of the bridge" (GA7:156/PLT 152). With respect to bridges this seems plausible, as is suggested by the frequency of place names that have to do with river crossings: Cambridge, Stourbridge, Saarbrücken, Oxford, Stanford, and so on. It seems to me, nonetheless, that Heidegger has generalized too quickly from his paradigm

bridge, that he ought to have allowed for the possibility of dwelling spaces created around *natural* places, *natural* gatherings of the fourfold, a notion suggested by other place names: the very name "Heidelberg," for instance, is an abbreviation of "Heidelbeerenberg," Blueberry Mountain. It seems, moreover, difficult to reconcile the idea that authentic building requires that the builder *already* dwells with the idea that dwelling spaces come into being only *after* an iconic building is completed. If the builder "dwells" prior to building there must exist, surely, at least a kind of dwelling space that is prior to building.

Because dwelling is always "poetic," because only POETRY lights up the hidden, conceptually ungraspable "dimension" that creates the sense of the sacredness of the site presupposed by authentic building, Heidegger says that "as the authentic measuring-out of the dimension of dwelling, poetry is the primal form of building" (GA7:206/PLT 225). Authentic building, building that, because it is built out of dwelling, "allows dwelling" (GA7:162/PLT 157), is not the product of architecture and engineering alone. It requires, too, the sensibility of a Hölderlin.

<div align="right">

Julian Young

</div>

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA7:145–64, 189–208/PLT 165–87, 213–29

C

CAN-BE (*SEINKÖNNEN*). SEE ABILITY-TO-BE.

32.
CARE (*SORGE*)

Care is, heidegger tells us in *Being and Time*, the being of Dasein, as the title of Division 1, chapter 6 declares. Before analyzing care in detail in 1.6, Heidegger develops two related terms, concern (*Besorgen*) and solicitude (*Fürsorge*). We may think of "care" as a piece of technical terminology appropriated to name a specific structural phenomenon identified in 1.6 – "ahead-of-itself-in-being-already-in-(the-world) as being-amidst (intra-worldly encountering entities)" – as well as a term chosen for its definite linguistic overtones.

As we shall see below, Heidegger directly embeds concern in the structure of care. The phenomenological connection between care and solicitude is less direct, however. Here the overtones referred to above do more of the work. It is therefore helpful to treat the structural analysis and the overtones separately. In what follows, I will begin with the structural phenomenon analyzed in 1.6, then examine concern and solicitude, as well as the connotations that link them to care, and conclude with a brief examination of the textual history of these words.

1   CARE AS THE BEING OF DASEIN

In the very title of Division 1, chapter 6 of *Being and Time*, Heidegger appropriates the word "care" as a technical term to designate the being of Dasein. He then formally introduces the structural phenomenon named by care in §41, "The Being of Dasein as Care":

> The formal existential totality of the ontological structural whole of Dasein must, therefore, be grasped in the following structure: the being of Dasein means: ahead-of-itself-in-being-already-in-(the-world) as being-amidst (intraworldly encountering entities). This being fulfills the meaning of the term *care*, which we use purely ontologico-existentially. (SZ 192)

This structure thus comprehends three facets: (1) ahead-of-itself; (2) being-already-in-(the-world); and (3) being-amidst (intraworldly encountering entities). Before proceeding, note that the second and third facets include a parenthetical element, whereas the first does not. The first facet is reflexive – Dasein is ahead of *itself* – whereas the second and third are not.

2   AHEAD-OF-ITSELF

Heidegger introduces the "ahead-of-itself" earlier in §41 by way of an aspect of Dasein's being that he analyzed back in §9: Dasein's being is at stake or at issue in its very existing. He writes,

> Dasein is an entity whose being is at issue in its being. The "is at issue" was clarified in the being-constitution of understanding as self-projecting being towards one's own-most ability-to-be. Dasein is in each case how it is for the sake of the latter. (SZ 191)

We may tease two features out of the "is at issue": Dasein's being *makes a difference* to Dasein, and Dasein's being is always *unsettled, in question.* Let us begin with the second feature, being unsettled.

In everything Dasein does, who it is is up for grabs. That is, in acting one way rather than another, Dasein takes a stand on who it is. By throwing myself into combing through Heidegger's corpus for uses of *Sorge*, I understand myself as a scholar. If instead I threw myself into the details of brewing beer, I would understand myself as a brewer. This is to say, Dasein is what it does: "'One is' what one pursues" (SZ 239).[1] Self-understanding is changeable, rather than stagnant. I can give up being a scholar and devote my life henceforth to brewing. What's more, self-understanding is always susceptible to challenge and questioning. This is the sense in which one's being is *at issue* in living. I (or someone else) can challenge my self-understanding, either by questioning *how* I pursue my current way of life ("That's not proper scholarship! You're failing to implement appropriate standards of textual exegesis!") or by challenging my devotion to this way of life at all ("Scholarship is creature of a bygone era! Google Analytics has superseded textual exegesis!"). Heidegger sums this feature up nicely in the concluding words of his 1924 lecture to the Marburger Theologenschaft, "The Concept of Time": "then Dasein would be being-questionable" (GA64:125).[2] For this reason Heidegger declares in Division II that "the certainty of the resolution means: holding itself free for its possible and always factically necessary retraction [*Zurücknahme*]" (SZ 307–08). One must always be open to retracting one's self-understanding, because the latter is susceptible to criticism, challenge, and rejection.

In order for Dasein's being to be at issue or questionable in everything it does, its being must *matter* to it. In throwing myself into the life of a scholar or a brewer, I respond to what matters, what is significant or important, in this way of life. Dasein's being matters to it, and so it is called by its being to its being. (Heidegger analyzes this calling under the heading of "conscience," and Dasein's susceptibility to the call, its responsiveness to it, under the heading of "guilt."[3]) If no way forward in my life mattered to me, if the world were fundamentally insignificant to me, then I would be unable to understand myself. This is one way of interpreting anxiety in *Being and Time*, and it signals a unique and radical breakdown of Dasein's being.[4] We shall return to this point below. Finally, because these ways of life matter and call us forth into action, Heidegger designates them "for-the-sakes-of-which": they constitute the *point* of our activity.

3 ALREADY-IN-(THE-WORLD)

Dasein is not only ahead-of-itself; in being ahead-of-itself, Dasein is also in-the-world. Of course, we already know from chapter 3 of Division I that Dasein is being-in-the-world. Heidegger's explanation here (in §41) of the connection between being-ahead-of-itself and being-already-in-the-world does not add much to the phenomenological exposition he provided in I.3: he reminds us that Dasein's for-the-sake-of-which, in terms of which it understands itself, is inextricably interwoven with the roles that define the available entities that populate

---

[1] "'*Man ist' das, was man betreibt.*" This statement nominally concerns only Dasein in its everydayness, *das Man*, that is, the anyone-self (*das Man-selbst*). Whether that characterization is overridden in authenticity must be addressed in the interpretation of the latter phenomenon.
[2] "*Dann wäre Dasein Fraglichsein.*"   [3] See Blattner 2015.   [4] See Blattner 1994.

the practical world: "there [in 1.3] it turned out that the totality of assignments of significance [or REFERENCES], which constitute worldhood, is 'anchored' in a for-the-sake-of-which" (SZ 192).[5] The point is familiar to readers of *Being and Time*, and so we need only rehearse it quickly. Looking "up" from "below," the defining assignment or reference that makes a hammer is a (set of) functional use-relations, such as *for driving nails*, *for pulling nails*, etc. Those use-relations tie a hammer to various tasks that Dasein performs by means of the hammer, and those tasks are what they are, in turn, by serving in more comprehensive patterns of human activity, such as repairing furniture, building houses, and so on. Those patterns of activity are animated, finally, by for-the-sakes-of-which, ways in which Dasein understands itself, such as being the provider for a family, being a cabinet maker, etc. So, the very being of a hammer – its involvement or AFFORDANCE (*Bewandtnis*), as Heidegger calls it – is constituted by and thus dependent upon Dasein's manifold ways of understanding itself. Looking "down" from "above," Dasein's for-the-sakes-of-which are what they are only insofar as they are bound up with the tasks in which they are carried out. To be a textual scholar is to edit manuscripts, to compile lists of references, to examine textual histories, and so on. One cannot throw oneself into being a textual scholar without turning to the tasks a textual scholar performs. The ahead-of-itself, in which Dasein projects a for-the-sakes-of-which to which it is called, and the being-already-in-(the-world), in which Dasein encounters a practical world of tasks and equipmental roles, require each other.

4 BEING-AMIDST (INTRAWORLDLY ENCOUNTERING ENTITIES)

The final element of the tripartite structure of care is being-amidst (*Sein-bei*, "being-alongside" in Macquarrie and Robinson's translation). "In ahead-of-itself-being-in-a-world there lies, essentially included therewith, falling *being amidst* intraworldly available entities with which [Dasein] is concerned" (SZ 192). There are two things to note about this sentence. First, this facet of care connects the formal, structural phenomenon of care with the existentialist concerns embodied in the language of "FALLING." In the immediately preceding sentence, Heidegger writes, "in this falling being amidst *x*,[6] fleeing in the face of UNCANNINESS announces itself; it mostly remains covered up along with latent anxiety, because the PUBLICNESS of the ANYONE suppresses all mistrust" (SZ 192). The connections between care, falling, uncanniness, flight, and anxiety, to which Heidegger gestures here, are murky and contested.

Second, Heidegger connects care (*Sorge*) with concern (*Besorgen*) in the analysis of the third facet of care; this in effect "embeds" concern within care. As we saw above, in understanding myself as (acting for the sake of) being a scholar, I assign or refer myself to the tasks performed by scholars: textual research, conference presentations, negotiating with publishers (when one is lucky), and so on. Pursuing these tasks, in turn, assigns or refers me to engaging with the equipment, paraphernalia, and gear caught up in them. I cannot edit a text without engaging with an author's manuscripts, whether they be printed, on microfilm, or electronic. I cannot

---

[5] Terminological reminders: an *assignment* (sometimes translated "reference") is the relation between an entity available and its defining toward-this. So, a hammer is (among other things) in order to drive nails; this constitutive in-order-to relation is its assignment. *Significance* is another name for the totality of assignment relations; it *is* the worldhood of the world, i.e., what makes a world a world, rather than simply a heap of entities.

[6] I will use variables where Heidegger uses ellipses in order to distinguish, for the reader, cases in which I have removed words from the quotations from cases in which Heidegger uses an ellipsis in the way in which we would today use a variable.

give a presentation at a conference without engaging with airplanes, trains, or cabs, or alternatively with webcams and microphones. To understand oneself as *x* is to assign oneself to interacting with available entities that are involved in the tasks interwoven with *x*. Heidegger calls this engagement with available entities "concern," and we will examine it in a more focused way below.

5   PULLING THE STRUCTURE OF CARE TOGETHER

In spelling out the three facets of care, Heidegger also uses the terms "existentiality," "FACTI-CITY," and "falling." He does not use "existentiality" directly in the paragraph devoted to the ahead-of-itself, but he does deploy it, along with "facticity," in the paragraph devoted to being-already-in: "expressed differently: existing is always factical. Existentiality is essentially determined by facticity" (SZ 192). As we saw above, Heidegger uses "falling" to characterize the third facet of care. Why, then, does Heidegger not just identify care as existentiality, facticity, and falling? The answer must be that he offers the more elaborate formula – "ahead-of-itself-in-being-already-in-(the-world) as being-amidst (intraworldly encountering entities)" – as an exposition of the unity of existentiality, facticity, and falling. If nothing else, the extensive use of hyphenation in the formula is meant to signal that unity. We might ask, however, how much "value added" does §41 actually provide to our understanding of this unity?

The most significant element added by the care structure in §41 is the TEMPORALITY of care. Heidegger aligns the ahead-of-itself with the future and the already-in with the past. Let us consider first the ahead-of-itself. To be responsive to the call of the life of a scholar is to be called *forth* into action. Insofar as I am called by the life of a scholar, I am beckoned into a future, a way I should act going forward. This explains why Heidegger uses the term "ahead" in naming the first facet of care: I am ahead of myself, out in front of myself, insofar as I take a stand on who I am. Thus, he writes (II.3, §65) that, "The ahead-of-itself is grounded in the future" (SZ 327). The adverb "already" embedded in "already-in" overtly signals the temporal dimension of facticity, and indeed, in §65 he writes, "the being-already-in *x* of itself announces beenness" (SZ 327). Finally, although the present-oriented character of being-amidst is muted in §41, in §65 Heidegger also makes that explicit: "being-amidst *x* is made possible in enpresenting" (SZ 327).[7]

In reaching forward to §65 and the analysis of Dasein's originary temporality (*ursprüngliche Zeitlichkeit*), we are reaching beyond the confines of the official analysis of care in Division 1 of *Being and Time*. There is solid textual basis for doing this, however. Toward the end of §41, Heidegger writes,

> The determination of care as being-ahead-of-itself – in-being-already-in – as being-amidst makes clear that this phenomenon is also in itself structurally *articulated*. Is this not, however, the phenomenal indication that the ontological question must be pressed further, toward the exposition of an *even more originary* phenomenon, one that ontologically carries the unity and totality of the structural manifold of care? (SZ 196)

---

[7] Heidegger concocts the neologism "beenness" (*Gewesenheit*) to name the distinctive way in which Dasein has a past, and he takes over the Husserlian term "enpresenting" (*Gegenwärtigen*) to name Dasein's distinctive present. In Husserl, "enpresenting" refers to the presenting that takes place in perception. See Husserl 2001b, vol. II, where Findlay renders *Gegenwärtigen* as "direct presentation."

Heidegger makes good on the promissory note in §65:

> When we first secured this articulated structure [viz., care], we pointed out that the ontological question with regard to this articulation must be pressed further, all the way to laying bare the unity of the totality of the structural manifold.[8] *The originary unity of the structure of care lies in temporality.* (SZ 327)

We may, then, view §41 and the official structure of care as a stepping stone on the way to the analysis of temporality in Division II. §41 *identifies* the structural unity of existence, facticity, and falling, but it does not purport to *explain* that unity. That task is remanded to Division II's analysis of originary TEMPORALITY (see also TIME).

6 CONCERN AND SOLICITUDE

Heidegger first introduces the technical term "concern" in *Being and Time* on page 57, where he appropriates it to designate "manifold ways of being-in" into which being-in-the-world is "scattered" or "split up." He gives a list of such concrete ways of being-in that includes ways in which Dasein relates to artifacts and tools (e.g., producing and using), tasks (e.g., following through and undertaking), and others (addressing and questioning). The first two groups (artifacts and tools, tasks) are classes of available entities,[9] but others are not. We shall see below that Heidegger subsequently spins off our relation to others and assigns it to the term "solicitude." The overall flavor of the examples Heidegger gives is that of practical engagement with the world. He only seems to distance himself from this reading when he writes, "we have not chosen the term because roughly Dasein is primarily and for the most part economical and 'practical,' but rather because the being of Dasein itself will be made visible as *care*" (SZ 57). Since the word "practical" (*praktisch*) is set in apposition with "economical," we may infer that he means practical in the sense of prudent, well-chosen, or efficient. Earlier in the paragraph he already indicated that "omission, neglect, abstention, resting" are "*deficient* modes" of concern. Thus, concern encompasses both the positive modes of taking care of business, whether more or less efficiently, and the deficient modes just listed. It is simply engaging with the world, however precisely Dasein exemplifies that.

We saw above that Heidegger uses "concern" in spelling out being-amidst, which is Dasein's constitutive relation to the intraworldly entities with which it engages in its day-to-day business. Being-already-in is a relation to the world, which is, as Heidegger explains in §18, that "IN-TERMS-OF-WHICH [Dasein] lets entities that have the manner of being of affordance encounter it" (SZ 86). So, the contrast between the second facet of care (being-already-in) and concern is the contrast between Dasein's constitutive relation to intraworldly entities, on the one hand, and its relation to the world, in terms of which those entities present themselves to Dasein. In fact, concern is somewhat more specific than simply Dasein's constitutive relation to intraworldly entities, because others are intraworldly as well.[10] In introducing "solicitude" (*Fürsorge*), he writes,

---

[8] He here cites SZ 196 (quoted immediately above) in fn. 1 on this page.

[9] This only becomes truly clear in §18 of SZ, when Heidegger broadens the scope of the term "available" to cover anything whose being has the character of involvement, including, e.g., hammering. See SZ 84. Later we learn that we can also concern ourselves with time (§§79–80), but this requires a "leveled off" interpretation of time, in which it is understood as an entity.

[10] Thus, in introducing the "with-like" character of being-in-the-world, Heidegger writes, "The intraworldly being-in -themselves of others is *Dasein*-with" (SZ 118).

the entity to which Dasein relates as being-with does not, however, have the manner of being of available equipment; it is itself Dasein. Dasein does not concern itself with this entity, but rather stands in solicitude [with it]. (SZ 121)

Thus, Heidegger differentiates concern, which is Dasein's relation to intraworldly entities that are available, from solicitude, which is Dasein's relation to others.

In both cases, Heidegger states that he has chosen the terms in question ("concern" and "solicitude") to signal that they are modes of care. In what way are they modes of care? They are not specific forms of the tripartite structural whole that we examined in detail above. In fact, concern seems to be embedded in one facet of that whole, being-amidst intraworldly available entities. There must be some other connection between care, on the one hand, and concern and solicitude, on the other. To explore this, we should turn now to the connotations of the word "care."

7   THE CHOICE OF THE WORD "CARE"

Why does Heidegger choose the word "care" to name the structural whole of ahead-of-itself-in-being-already-in-(the-world) as being-amidst (intraworldly encountering entities)? Immediately after he lays out the structure of care in §41 of *Being and Time*, he offers a "confirmation" of his interpretation of the being of Dasein as care, in the form of the Roman fable "Care."[11] The upshot of the fable is that humankind is made by Care, who shapes clay and asks Jupiter to breathe life (soul) into it. When Care, Earth, and Jupiter disagree over what this new creation should be called, Saturn (time) is called upon to decide. Saturn declares that upon the death of the new creature, Jupiter will receive its soul and Earth its body. During its lifetime it is entrusted to Care, while in honor of Earth's contribution, the new creature will be named "homo" (human), from *humus* (earth). Heidegger is, obviously, intrigued by the allegorical reading of the fable, in which not only are humans entrusted to Care during their lifetime, but the ultimate decision about what humankind's being means is made by time. He does concede from the outset, however, that the significance of the fable is "'merely historical'" (SZ 197, shudder-quotes in the original).

Heidegger's commentary on the fable is interesting, not as literary criticism, but as an indication of how he wants the reader to hear the word "care." He writes that he arrives at the term "care" not as a matter of "theoretical-ontical generalization," but rather through a generalization that is "*a priori-ontological*" (SZ 199). In other words, he does not begin with the everyday phenomena of worry, concern (in its non-technical senses), distress, or grief and then generalize to what they all have in common. Rather, he writes,

> the *perfectio* of humankind, becoming what it can be in its being-free for its ownmost possibilities (projection), is an "accomplishment" of "care." It equioriginarily determines, however, the fundamental manner (*Grundart*) of this entity, in accordance with which it is delivered over to the world of its concern (thrownness). The "double meaning" of "*cura*" intends *a* fundamental constitution in its essentially twofold structure of thrown projection. (SZ 199)

---

[11] The fable was once thought to have been recorded by the Roman author Gaius Julius Hyginus, but recent scholarship has cast doubt on that (see the entry for "Hyginus[(3)]" in Hornblower, Spawforth, and Eidinow 2012). A translation prepared by Mary Grant in her translations of Hyginus' myths (Grant 1960) may be found online here: www.theoi.com/Text/HyginusFabulae5.html#220.

So, the essential feature in virtue of which Heidegger uses the term "care" is that Dasein is thrown projection. He does not say much more to explain his word-choice, and so we must reconstruct his motivation. The emphasis on THROWNNESS in this passage suggests that Heidegger's point might be that Dasein's being-free requires that it be thrown into a world. Projection requires that one be situated in a world and that the manifold possibilities on offer in that world matter to Dasein differentially.

This brings us back to one of the points with which we began this discussion of "care": things matter to Dasein. "Mattering" and "care" are linked connotatively, and that might be, in the end, the basic reason why Heidegger chooses "care" for the name of the being of Dasein: Dasein is the entity to whom things matter. John Haugeland once wrote that "the problem with artificial intelligence is that computers don't give a damn" (Haugeland 1979, 619). As catchy a slogan as this is, it is not quite right. Computers neither give a damn nor don't. Only entities for whom things fundamentally matter can fail to give a damn, à la Rhett Butler. Not giving a damn is a privative or deficient mode of caring. Dasein is at its root an entity whose being matters to it, as Heidegger states in the fifth sentence of §9 of *Being and Time*. Because its being matters to it (care), so do others (solicitude) and intraworldly available entities (concern).

8   TEXTUAL HISTORY OF THE TERMS CARE (SORGE), CONCERN (BESORGEN), AND SOLICITUDE (FÜRSORGE)

The vast majority of the uses of *Sorge* cataloged in the *Heidegger Concordance* (Jaran and Perrin 2013) are from *Being and Time* or its immediately surrounding texts, so from Heidegger's "Phenomenological Decade."[12] Since it is such a common word, however, it occurs throughout the corpus non-technically. Although he uses it less frequently, the same may be said of "concern" (*besorgen*). "Solicitude" (*Fürsorge*) has an even more constrained range, occurring pretty much exclusively in *Being and Time* and *Logic: The Question of Truth* (GA21, 1925/26).

In some texts in the years preceding *Being and Time*, Heidegger uses "care" apparently interchangeably with "concern," as e.g., in *Ontology – The Hermeneutics of Facticity* (GA63, 1923): "this going-about in the contexture of assignments characterizes *caring as going-about* [*Sorgen als Umgehen*]" (GA63:101). A year later, in *Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy* (GA18, 1924), he writes, "*being-there as concern is care about itself*" (GA18:131).

In *Phenomenological Interpretations of Aristotle* (GA61, 1921/22), "care" first begins to appear extensively and with a technical meaning. Here he identifies caring as the "relational sense" (*Bezugssinn*) of the comportment of living (*Leben*).[13] That is very close to the idea that care is the being of Dasein. In GA61 he issues the same warnings as he does later in *Being and Time*, namely, that we should not allow our sense of the word "care" to be weighed down with the connotations of "a mood of funereal bitterness" (GA61:90). It is a name, rather, for the way in which Dasein relates to anything. This is an early formulation of the idea that "care" is an ontological and structural feature of being-in-the-world. It is structural because it is a "relational sense," rather than an object or ontic feature of our comportment. Since he uses

---

[12]   The term is due to Kisiel 1993, 59.
[13]   Steven Crowell argues persuasively that in GA61 *Bezugssinn* is a successor to Husserl's noetic act character or quality. See Crowell 2001a, 142.

"concern" hardly at all in GA61, we cannot assess whether he meant to distinguish "concern" and "care."

In *The Concept of Time* (GA64, 1924), Heidegger begins to distinguish "care" and "concern" as he would in *Being and Time*: "the being [of Dasein] is abstractable as *care*. . . . Concern unfurls [*entfaltet*] itself as the proximal way of being of [the] being [of Dasein]" (GA64:31). In other words, Dasein's "closest" way of everyday being is engagement with the practical entities of the world, what he calls "concern" in *Being and Time*. By *Logic* (GA20) from the Winter Semester of 1925/26 – which is the period during which Heidegger composed *Being and Time* – the tripartite distinction between "care," "concern," and "solicitude" is in full flower, as is in evidence in the title of §17 of that lecture series: "Care as the Being of Dasein: Solicitude and Concern; Authenticity and Inauthenticity" (GA20:220).

Immediately after *Being and Time* the terms suddenly vanish from Heidegger's vocabulary. An explanation of this rapid disappearance must be bound up with a more comprehensive study of the rapid changes in Heidegger's thinking in the later years of the 1920s.

William Blattner

CARRY OUT (*VOLLZIEHEN*). SEE ACTUALIZATION.

CASE (*SACHE*). SEE MATTER, THE.

CAST (*WERFEN, WURF*). SEE THROWNNESS.

33.
CERTAINTY (*GEWISSHEIT*)

CERTAINTY IS THE "TRUTH" of entities in MODERNITY. Heidegger primarily discusses certainty in connection to Descartes, who used certainty as the criterion of truth in his philosophy: that which we can know is that of which we can be certain. Heidegger discusses Cartesian certainty both as a foil for his early thought, and as an essential moment in the history of metaphysics emphasized in his later thought.

The following passage brings out three important elements of truth as certainty:

> [1] something true is that which man of himself clearly and distinctly brings before himself and [2] confronts as what is thus brought before him (re-presented) in order to guarantee what is represented in such a confrontation. The assurance of such representation is certainty. [3] What is true in the sense of being certain is what is real. . . . Representational thinking which is free of doubt is clear and distinct thinking. (GA6.2:389/EP 25)

First, when truth is understood as certainty, certainty is put forth as the primary condition for knowledge. One is certain of an OBJECT when one has a clear and distinct REPRESENTATION of it; one's representation is free of doubt. One would fail to be completely certain, for example, if one were viewing something from afar, or in a dimly lit room; here, one might have lingering doubts that one's representation is distorted. However, a clear and distinct representation secures certainty, and thus knowledge of some object.

Second, when truth is understood as certainty, a reflexivity is introduced that incorporates human self-knowledge into any instance of knowing. Holding some object in one's mind or being conscious of some object does not yet constitute knowledge; one must also be self-consciously certain of it. When acquiring any piece of knowledge, the SUBJECT must be co-present with the object, affirming her certainty of it: as Heidegger puts it earlier in the text, "only that knowledge is valid as knowledge which at the same time knows itself and what it knows as such, and is certain of itself in this knowledge" (GA6.2:384/EP 20). The incorporation of the knowing subject into any access to truth is apparent from Descartes' discussion of self-knowledge or self-consciousness (*Selbstbewußtsein*): because he considers *cogito ergo sum* ("I think therefore I am") to be the most secure item of knowledge, it forms the ground of all other items of knowledge.

Third, when truth is understood as certainty, truth is indexed to human forms of knowing; "what is true in the sense of being certain is what is real" (GA6.2:389/EP 25). Entities are understood in relation to the human perspective and their essential properties are those of which we can be certain; thus, there is a privileging of those properties that humans can calculate exactly (i.e., scientific and mathematical properties). When truth is understood as certainty, the way things *are* is how they are represented

to us; the "world" (from nature to the cosmos to human history) accords with our "picture" of it.

Heidegger explicitly criticizes Descartes' notion of "truth as certainty" in *Being and Time* §21. Heidegger claims that Descartes' method of using certainty as the criterion for truth prevented him from raising the question of being (SZ 24). Marion 1992 reconstructs Heidegger's argument that, for Descartes, the certainty of the *ego cogito* overshadowed its *sum*. Descartes' certainty is unacceptably indeterminate, in that one seems to be identically certain when it comes both to knowing oneself and knowing other objects; though the self is one's "first certainty" from which the other certainties are derived, these two objects of certainty are not distinguished ontologically. This approach does not inquire into the mode of being of the self, or differentiate it from the mode of being of extended objects. Moreover, Descartes' emphasis on certainty leads to overlooking AVAILABLE entities; objects are something for us to represent to ourselves and become certain about, rather than to interact with practically. For Descartes, entities are OCCURRENT rather than available. Focusing on certainty, then, prevented Descartes from recognizing the ontological distinctions that Heidegger draws between DASEIN, the available, and the occurrent.

Both Heidegger's early and later works put forth Descartes, with his particular emphasis on certainty, as characterizing the modern epoch of human understanding, though the HISTORY of METAPHYSICS is a particular focus of his later works. However, Heidegger also makes it clear that "truth as certainty" is also present in Leibniz's philosophy (GA5:245/183), and that this understanding of truth also appears in Kant (SZ 94, 203–04), Hegel (GA5:208/156), and Husserl (GA17:255).

Heidegger argues that the epoch of "truth as certainty" develops out of the Christian epoch of traditional metaphysics, where a proposition was taken to be true insofar as it conformed to some independent object (itself understood as an "*ens creatum*, that which is created by the personal creator-God who is considered to be the highest cause," GA5:90/68). Modern thinkers insert the subject into this picture, making the features of objects essentially dependent on his kind of knowing. A representation of an object is true when the representer is co-represented along with the object, as being certain about the representation, and "the representing … is right in relation to this claim to secureness" (GA5:244/QCT 89). Heidegger indicates that the modern epoch, with its understanding of truth as certainty, was followed by an epoch where the human perspective is even more central. This epoch of human understanding is encapsulated by Nietzsche's philosophy (GA5:247/QCT 91). Here, VALUE grounds the truth of entities, rather than certainty; the essential properties of entities are not those that can be represented by a human's secure knowing, but those properties that can be manipulated and put to use for human projects.

Morganna Lambeth

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Truth as certainty GA1:8, 73, 86, 88, 215, 297; SZ 136, 206; GA5:106–11/81–84; GA6.2:174/N4:142; GA6.2: 383–91/EP 19–26, 418ff./56ff.; GA29/30:23, 26–29; GA49:139; GA56/57:188; GA65:201–03, 336
Descartes and certainty SZ 249; GA5:38/28, 87/66; GA6.2:131, 150/N4:102, 120ff.; GA17:221–22, 224–25, 230, 242, 245, 247; GA49:118–19

Hegel GA5:68ff./51ff., 208/155–56; GA11:54, 58/ID 43, 49; GA15:130/HS 77–78; GA15:292–93/FS 13–14
Husserl GA17:255, 264, 266, 268, 270–73, 280–83, 286
Leibniz GA5:245/183; GA26:53
Nietzsche GA5:243–46/181–84
Certainty of death SZ 255–58, 264–65

FURTHER READING

Bernasconi 1987, Dreyfus 1991, 108–27

CHATTER (*GEREDE*). SEE IDLE TALK.

34.
CIRCUMSPECTION (*UMSICHT*)

Circumspection is the capacity by which we are able to fit entities into our practical activity. "Circumspection" is Macquarrie and Robinson's translation of *Umsicht*, a term cognate with *umsichtig*, which means "prudent" or "farseeing." While circumspection is briefly mentioned in some of Heidegger's lecture courses from the 1920s, it comes to prominence in *Being and Time*, where it is a central pillar in Heidegger's analysis of "average everydayness" in Division 1. As the translators note, *um-* can mean "around" as well as "in order to," and "*Sicht*" means "sight." Heidegger is quite aware of these connotations and it is no accident that he chose this term. For circumspection is the capacity by which we subordinate entities within our surroundings to our practical activity: "Dealings with equipment subordinate themselves to the manifold assignments of the 'in-order-to.' And the sight with which they thus accommodate themselves is *circumspection*" (SZ 69).

The "in-order-to" is the web of interconnected functional roles that are fulfilled by pieces of equipment. A knife in a kitchen, for instance, is there in-order-to cut. But it is also part of a wider context that includes the chopping board, the knife block, as well as the knife sharpener and so on. Each piece of equipment has a particular role in a context made up of other pieces of equipment which also have their own functional roles. Each piece of equipment within such a context also guides us toward other pieces of equipment. So, for instance, the knife orients one toward the chopping board, the chopping board (eventually) toward the sink, the sink toward the dishcloth and so on. For this reason, Heidegger claims that there is never strictly speaking "a" piece of equipment; every such piece always relates to other pieces within a practical context in terms of its "assignment" or "reference," that is, in terms of how it directs us about the place between other pieces of equipment toward the completion of a task. The "in-order-to" is Heidegger's name for this context of functional roles and reference taken as a whole.

So when Heidegger claims that the in-order-to has "manifold assignments," he means that the web of functional roles that makes up, for instance, a kitchen has many ways of directing us about the environment in which the equipment belongs according to the functional relations that pertain between pieces of equipment. To accommodate a dealing with equipment to the references or assignments of the in-order-to, then, is to allow the functional relations that pertain between pieces of equipment to guide one's use of equipment within a particular environment. This happens, for instance, when one is directed to reach for the knife sharpener by the knife upon the recognition of its bluntness. In this case, how one deals with the knife is given authoritative direction by the knife's place within the kitchen and its relation to other tools.

This is not the whole story, however. For the references of the in-order-to are under the sway of the task toward the completion of which the equipment is employed. Knives can be used for tasks other than cooking. For instance, I might reach for a knife in order to cut a plastic tie that holds a bottle opener to its packaging. And in that case I would be directed by the knife around my environment in a different way (I would not be inclined to move toward

the chopping board, for instance). So the references of the in-order-to – that is, the specific ways in which tools orient us toward other tools – are ordered by the task toward which the equipment is employed. For this reason, the accommodation of one's dealings with equipment to the references in-order-to is a matter of allowing the task at hand to be authoritative for how the equipment in a given context guides one about an environment and thereby authoritative for how one deals with tools.

Circumspection is the "sight" with which this accommodation is achieved. Heidegger can be unhelpfully broad in his elaboration of the notion of sight (at one point he claims that "sight" characterizes our access to being and all entities in general! Cf. SZ 147), but it is relatively clear what he has in mind by describing circumspection in this way. "If we look at Things just 'theoretically,' we can get along without understanding AVAILABLENESS. But when we deal with them by using them and manipulating them, this activity is not a blind one; it has its own kind of sight [i.e., circumspection]" (SZ 69). By contrasting theoretical sight to circumspective sight, Heidegger is insisting that mindedness is not the preserve of the theoretical; we can be engaged in an intelligent, minded way with practical tasks as well. The fact that we can talk disparagingly of someone's carrying on with a piece of work in an absent, mindless way is testament to this. But while Heidegger holds that, as with theoretical comportment, circumspection is *intelligent*, he denies that it shares theoretical intelligence's predicative, representational character. Circumspection is practical engagement's *own* kind of intelligence.

Tools place constraints both on the tasks for which they can be used as well as on how one can use them for those roles. Even though there is an indefinite number of roles to which tools can be assigned, and even though there are indefinitely many ways in which tools can be used to fulfill those roles, tools are nonetheless not entirely malleable; dealing with them requires sensitivity to which roles they in fact allow themselves to be assigned and the ways in which they allow themselves to be used. And different tools place different constraints. Furthermore, different tasks require different things of different tools. So while a simple bit of woodwork might require nothing too demanding of a hammer, if one were to set about making a stop-motion animation of marching hammers one would have to use those hammers differently. There is an obvious place for intelligence here, then, for accommodating our relationships with equipment to practical tasks has to involve figuring out how to use the specific tools we have in the specific ways they allow themselves to be used according to what the particular task at hand specifically demands, given the indefinitely vast range of possibilities available. But in figuring out how to use a novel kind of can opener, for instance, one need not engage in an internal monologue about the properties of the tool; one can become familiar with the tool through the use of it alone. This requires a kind of intelligent sensitivity to the ways in which the tool functions, but it need not involve presenting to oneself any particular representations of the tool; we can just come to see how it works.

Putting all this together, then, circumspection is that practical, pre-predicative intelligence by way of which one is able to appropriately accommodate equipment within one's practical activity.

Now, Heidegger claims that equipment has a tendency to "withdraw" from conscious attention and remain part of one's grasp of the environment just in terms of its functional role, what he calls "circumspective letting-function" (GA24:442). Even for the most part, Heidegger claims, the entities we encounter circumspectively are non-thematic.

> What is first of all "given" … is the "for-writing," the "for-entering-and-exiting," the "for-illuminating," the "for-sitting." That is, writing, entering-exiting, sitting and the like are what we are *a priori* involved with. (GA21:144)

The keys of the keyboard with which I am typing do not present themselves as objects bearing determinate properties; having attained a certain proficiency at typing, I can just get on with typing without having to pay attention to the keyboard at all. Indeed, part of an intelligent use of equipment involves understanding that certain tools have to be allowed to "withdraw" in this way if we are to get on with the task at hand; an intelligent operation with a keyboard will strive to allow the keys to drop out of conscious, focal attention.

In light of considerations such as these, it can be tempting to think that with "circumspection" Heidegger has in mind a capacity contrasted to focal, determinate PERCEPTION (*Wahrnehmung*). On that reading, circumspection *just is* the capacity for encountering entities in this non-focal, indeterminate way in which they are manifest solely in terms of the functional role they fulfill. This reading is mistaken, however, for circumspective withdrawal is only one way of appropriately relating to equipment given the demands of the activity with which one is engaged and so only one way in which circumspection subordinates or accommodates the relationship to equipment to the assignments ordered by the task at hand.

Heidegger claims that equipment, if functioning incorrectly, encounters us no longer solely in terms of its function but also in terms of the specific properties that are inhibiting its proper functioning. So a door that fails to open will draw one to look for some specific properties of the door that are keeping it shut. In such cases, the tool that had been withdrawn becomes thematic. Heidegger insists, however, that in being encountered in this way the door does not simply become an object for theoretical contemplation; we continue to relate to the door *as* a tool. We can extend the point further. When driving down a motorway one is frequently required to determinately perceive the cars that are around one in order to avert disaster, even if all one determines by such perception is the position and speed of the other vehicles (and so ignores, for instance, their model or color). So it is not just in breakdown situations that we are drawn to determinately perceive entities around us and resist their withdrawal; that kind of perception can be part and parcel of the very absorption in the task at hand, without which we would meet a sticky end. Such determinate perceptions are quite obviously ways of dealing with entities around one in a manner subordinate to the task with which one is engaged. One looks at the cars or the door in the way one does *because* the task with which one is engaged demands that behavior, and one is navigated around one's environment on the basis of what one sees. So on that score both of these examples of determinate perception count as circumspective: both involve subordinating one's dealings with equipment to the assignments of the in-order-to, which assignments are under the sway of the task one is undertaking. But these examples could not count as circumspective if circumspection were just the capacity for non-thematic practical awareness. So circumspection cannot be both the capacity to accommodate our dealings with entities to the tasks with which we are engaged and so narrow as to only include non-thematic awareness. And as Heidegger is clear that circumspection is the former, it cannot be the latter.

Circumspection is, then, the intelligence through which one is able to appropriately deal with entities within one's environment according to the requirements of one's tasks. That is, it is the capacity to work out how entities fit within one's activity and thus to determine one's relationship with them. Circumspection *involves* the ability to allow entities to withdraw; the capacity to

encounter entities purely in terms of their purposive roles is obviously part and parcel of the capacity to intelligently accommodate entities within one's involvements. For if one lacked *that* capacity one would not be so much as able to fluidly use a keyboard. But circumspection is not reducible to that capacity insofar as determining, perceptual comportments can be appropriate ways of accommodating entities within one's practical activity, for instance, in the case of encountering an entity as bearing the determinate properties that are stopping it from functioning smoothly.

David Batho

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 69–88, 102–12, 118–25, 131, 136–38, 141, 146–49, 156–58, 172, 187, 208, 220, 228, 261, 297, 312, 315, 326, 333, 335, 341, 342, 351–64, 387, 406–07, 412, 419–21; GA4:94/117; GA6.1:502–03/N3:73; GA9:229/175; GA10:39/25; GA12:202/OWL 107; GA13:131; GA14:434; GA17:104–05; GA18:63, 66, 68, 165–67, 183, 193, 265, 368–69; GA19: 21–22, 28, 45, 47, 51, 138, 143, 159, 163, 166; GA20:265, 287, 379, 381, 400; GA21:6; GA22:25, 209; GA23:20–27; GA24:154, 232, 239, 390, 437, 441–42; GA25:25; GA27:201; GA33:126, 128; GA47:139–40: GA53:165; GA54:201; GA64:36–37, 41, 60, 65–66, 68–69, 92

FURTHER READING

Wrathall 2017a

CIRCUMSTANCES (*BEWANDTNIS*). SEE AFFORDANCE.

35.
CLEARING (*LICHTUNG*)

"Clearing" names the illumination belonging to Dasein as a being who understands being, and who through this understanding discloses itself and the world. Heidegger first uses the term "clearing" (*Lichtung*) in §28 of *Being and Time*, entitled "The task of a thematic analysis of being-in." Heidegger connects the disclosure of the clearing to the traditional idea of the *lumen naturale* or "natural light," as a figurative description of human UNDERSTANDING. He adds, however: "To say that it [i.e., Dasein] is 'illuminated' ['*erleuchtet*'] means that *as* BEING-IN-THE-WORLD it is cleared [*gelichtet*] in itself, not through any other entity, but in such a way that it *is* itself the clearing" (SZ 133). While the German word *Lichtung* can be construed as connoting brightness, and Heidegger does connect it here with a series of other terms involving illumination, it ordinarily means "clearing," such as a clearing in a forest. The metaphor in this case is of an open site, "cleared" of the too dense proximity of things that renders them invisible.

Heidegger is also emphatic in the passage that Dasein, the entity that I myself am, is *itself* the clearing. In being the kind of entity that it is, one that understands being and for which its own being is an issue, Dasein allows entities to step into the open or into the light. The "there" of Dasein, within which it and the world are simultaneously disclosed, is the clearing. While such disclosure can be described in terms of sight, as it often has been within the Western philosophical tradition, Heidegger cautions that "sight" and "seeing" should not be misinterpreted as "just perceiving with the bodily eyes" or some "pure non-sensory awareness of something" merely there as an object. It means, rather, allowing entities to be "encountered unconcealedly in themselves" (SZ 147). According to the analysis Heidegger gives in *Being and Time*, the disclosedness of Dasein is constituted by its having a self-reflexive relation to its own being, which it does not merely observe but which matters to it, and a corresponding relation to entities other than itself.

In other words, Dasein encounters itself, others, and things within the world on the basis of CARE: "That by which this entity is essentially cleared – in other words, that which makes it both 'open' for itself and 'bright' for itself – is what we have defined as 'care'" (SZ 350–51). "Care" (*Sorge*) is Heidegger's term for the being of Dasein as an entity whose own being matters to it and whose existence has the temporal structure of being always ahead of itself, already in a world and alongside entities encountered within the world. Dasein's understanding is structured by this TEMPORALITY. It occurs in part through a projection of possibilities into the future, an IMAGINATION of what may be: for instance, in the form of possible actions and ideals for one's own life, or scientific hypotheses anticipating a certain outcome. At the same time, it is guided and shaped by inherited conceptions; it has a "fore-structure." The appearance of entities in the present, therefore, the way they are encountered as being, is not the product of pure INTUITION, a mere mirroring or reflection of what lies before Dasein. It is, rather, given form by varieties of anticipating and recalling, so that the clearing is temporally structured, the result of an apprehending in which projection and preconception are essentially involved.

Consequently, the clearing is time-bound, situated within culture and HISTORY. It is also always finite and bounded by obscurity, emerging as a struggle to bring to light what lies as yet hidden in darkness. And it is opened up in the first place not by theoretical inquiry but by care, which defines the being of Dasein. William Richardson, in his classic work on Heidegger, *Through Phenomenology to Thought* (first edition, 1963) glosses the term as indicating the "luminosity of the There (disclosedness of the World)" which belongs to the basic existential constitution of Dasein (59). Hubert Dreyfus interprets this luminosity as a function of Dasein's being "always in the world by way of being in a situation – dealing with something specific in a context of things and people, directed toward some specific end, doing what it does for the sake of being Dasein in some specific way" (Dreyfus 1991, 163). In *Being and Time*, the clearing is, on Dreyfus's reading, Dasein's "shared situation" (*ibid.*, 165), resulting from its common practices and activities in specific circumstances. The aspect of the "clearing" Dreyfus emphasizes here, in accordance with the general thrust of his reading of *Being and Time* is, first, that Dasein's engagement with the world it discovers takes place primarily through pragmatic activity and, second, that the intelligibility of that world rests on its being a shared world, so that "each Dasein's 'there' is a shareable grasp of an already shared world" (*ibid.*, 165). Mark Wrathall likewise interprets the clearing as referring to a "pre-predicative familiarity with the world" which makes it possible to point out an entity (Wrathall 2006, 250).

These interpretations focus on *Being and Time*, which describes Dasein as the source of the clearing. In subsequent works, Heidegger increasingly insists that, while Dasein is the *site* of the clearing, it does not bring the clearing about through its own act. Rather, the clearing brings about Dasein, who is in a way "needed" for the disclosure of the world to happen. This point is touched on in the first of Heidegger's lecture courses on Schelling (1936), where he uses the term "clearing" to explicate Schelling's theology. For Schelling, God needs humanity in order to become actual, to emerge into clarity and be revealed. "Understanding is the faculty of clearing" (GA42:207/119), Heidegger comments, where "what is light is always the clearing of what is intertwined and entangled, what is veiled and obscure" (GA42:199/114). While Heidegger is explicating rather than accepting Schelling's theology and metaphysics, his interpretation also contains insights that accord with the results of his own phenomenological investigations. One of these is the sense that the clearing of the world constituted by multiple forms of human understanding is not itself effected by human beings. We do not determine that we are this site, nor do we determine its nature. In addition, Heidegger shares Schelling's sense that the emergence of humanity as a site for the clearing is *necessitated* by a process that transcends us, that there is a compelling need for disclosure, to which the existence of humanity is a response.

The claim, in *Being and Time*, that Dasein is the clearing, in the sense that disclosure is dependent on its interpretations with all that these involve, can be read in a subjectivist fashion, where Heidegger is proposing that the human subject constructs reality. However, the later writings reject this reading, emphasizing instead that Dasein is an open space in which the nature of things (the being of entities) is unconcealed or discovered, not fabricated. In the *Introduction to Metaphysics*, for instance, first given as a lecture course in 1935, Heidegger writes that "man should be understood, within the question of being, as *the* site which being requires in order to disclose itself. . . . Man is the site of the openness, the there," so that the essence of "Dasein" as "being-there" consists in its being "a site for the disclosure of being" (GA40:214/IM 205). At this juncture, Heidegger also sees disclosure or revealing as "original" TRUTH, an idea

for which he finds warrant in what he takes to be the original sense of the Greek word "*alêtheia*": namely, taking out of hiddenness. Humanity as the clearing is then also the site for the happening of truth.

There is on Heidegger's analysis an intimate connection between the human capacity for such disclosure and FREEDOM. The connection consists partly in the fact that the distance from entities – ourselves, others, things within the world, states of affairs – that allows us to have a relation with them as well as to imagine them as being possibly thus and not otherwise, is the source of freedom in the narrower and more customary sense as the capacity to choose a particular course of action. It consists also in the idea that freedom is involved in *binding* oneself to truth, whether in the context of negotiating one's own existence, or of scientific investigation where the researcher is committed to discovery and accepts evidence against projected hypotheses or anticipated results. For these reasons, Heidegger states, in "On the Essence of Truth," an essay whose first version was delivered as a public lecture in 1930, that in the first place "freedom is engagement in the disclosure of entities as such" (GA9:189/BW 126). The existence of Dasein, which Heidegger had defined in *Being and Time* as "being-in-the-world" and connected with the future-oriented realization of projected possibilities, is now defined in terms of such disclosure: "Disclosedness itself is conserved in ek-sistent engagement through which the openness of the open region, i.e. the there [*Da*] is what it is" (GA9:189/BW 126).

In 1933–34, Heidegger also gave a lecture course called *On the Essence of Truth*, in which he offers an interpretation of the metaphor of light in Plato's allegory of the cave. He notes that, for the Greeks, the association of the ideas with light rests on the observation that an advance knowledge of the essence of things is required for particular things to appear to our under-standing as being such and such (GA36/37:152–53). That knowledge is granted by the ideas, which we project in advance. The ideas therefore bestow the "light" in which particular things become visible. The highest idea is that of the good, conveyed in the sensory image of the sun (GA36/37:190). On Heidegger's reading, the GOOD is the ultimate source of the light of understanding because it determines the essential forms of things, the ordered arrangement through which they acquire their meaning so as to be unconcealed in their "truth." At this point in time, Heidegger suggests that the projection of the good, rooted in the freedom of Dasein to creatively envision a fit order of things, gives the world its structure while binding Dasein to the realization of the possible that lies beyond the actual: thus, "the good gives and it binds" (GA36/37:200). The political implication is that those who are able to grasp the good in an especially clear manner – i.e., those who can exit the cave so as to see the ideal forms of things in light of the good – have a pre-eminent insight into the right shape of the world. This thesis is intimately connected with Heidegger's support for National Socialism during these years and with his sense of his own educative mission in relation to this political movement.

We can see by now that "clearing" belongs to a cluster of semantically related terms including disclosure, unconcealing, light and lighting, revealing, manifestness, the open, and truth as *alêtheia*. By the mid 1930s, Heidegger comes to connect all of these terms with the idea that the ultimate source of human understanding – and thus of *being* human, since such understanding is what makes us what we are – is an event in which what-is becomes visible or accessible. This becomes the event or happening of the clearing, bestowed upon us rather than accomplished through our own power. In "The Origin of the Work of Art" (1935), he writes:

And yet – beyond what is, not away from it but before it, there is still something else that happens. In the midst of entities as a whole an open place occurs. There is a clearing, a lighting. Thought of in reference to what is, to entities, this clearing is in a greater degree than are entities. This open center is therefore not surrounded by what is; rather, the lighting center itself encircles all that is, like the Nothing which we scarcely know. (GA5:40/PLT 51)

On the basis of passages like this one, Reinhold May sees in Heidegger's later thought an identification of the clearing and "nothing," as the empty space in which what-is appears, arguing for a connection between this idea and the pictograph for "nothing" in ancient Chinese thought (May 1996, 31–34).

Whatever his historical sources may have been, one way of understanding the distinctiveness of the notion of the clearing that Heidegger develops in works like "The Origin of the Work of Art" is to position them against traditional Western conceptions of human understanding, noting what is being retained and what is being challenged and revised. With respect to what is retained, Heidegger is still speaking of understanding, connecting it with the metaphor of light, and proposing that this understanding defines the essence of human being. However, this is not the "light of reason" as traditionally understood, in a number of respects. For one thing, the clearing is not equivalent to correct representation or the giving of reasons. It names a disclosure necessarily prior to all such acts and procedures, for: "with all our correct representations we would get nowhere, we could not even presuppose that there already is manifest some-thing to which we can conform ourselves, unless the unconcealedness of entities had already exposed us to, placed us in that lighted realm in which every being stands for us and from which it withdraws" (GA5:39/PLT 51). The clearing is not first broken open by reason, nor is what comes to light within it limited to reason. Using Heidegger's illustration in "The Origin of the Work of Art," things within the world are disclosed to the peasant woman insofar as "she dwells in the overtness of entities, of the things that are" (GA5:31/PLT 43). This dwelling does not only or primarily involve ratiocination. It occurs in the course of pragmatic engagement, and in general through the way things enter the world of her experience, the way they touch her within the patterns of care that make up her life.

Furthermore, this entry of things into the "world" occurs within a space that, as Heidegger had outlined in *Being and Time*, is no less defined by affect than by understanding, nor are these in practice truly separable. It is also crucial to understand that the clearing never involves perfect luminosity, but "is pervaded by a constant concealment in the double form of refusal and dissembling" (GA5:41/PLT 52–53). Obscurity and disguise are permanent features of the clearing, and it follows that complete and perfect knowledge is impossible for the kinds of entities that we are. Truth is therefore always partial, won in constant struggle with error. Heidegger does not see this as a regrettable human limitation. Rather, the borders of the clearing actually *enable* the visibility granted by it. In other words, the boundaries of our grasp of the world and ourselves, including the concepts we inherit from our traditions, form the horizon within which we are able to understand. These concepts can be revised and expanded, but without a limiting horizon nothing definite would show up for us at all.

The bounded character of the clearing, the fact that it is a space at whose borders there is necessarily concealment, is a central aspect of the metaphor, indicating the fact that any definite possibility of being and revealing will exclude others. For example, absorbed pragmatic activity

reveals things as tools while pushing aside other forms of disclosure. The idea of being that dominates in a certain age also excludes possibilities. As Wrathall explains, "a new understanding of being can establish itself, and a new ordering of beings can become operative, only if there is something like a clearing that conceals any other way of experiencing the world in order to allow this particular way to come to the forefront" (Wrathall 2011, 33). The clearing is, he notes, "a space of possibilities" (33), and the possibilities that can be actual at one time are always a definite set. Heidegger therefore speaks of the turns in the history of being as involving a kind of decision, although in this case the decision is not the act of an individual or group of individuals. The metaphor of the clearing suggests that the basic concepts accepted in a certain historical period are limited, with the excluded possibilities being hidden from view, and also that the fact of this limitation is hidden.

This does not mean, however, that for Heidegger truth is merely a matter of human perspective and is therefore subjective. Emphasizing this point becomes an important element in Heidegger's reflections during the years following his disillusionment with Nazism and resignation from the Rectorate in 1934. In his notebooks from this period, Heidegger's occasional references to the "clearing" assert the idea of humanity as a site for the happening of truth in opposition to what he thinks is the metaphysical conception of humanity that informs the modern age, of which he sees Nazism as a symptom. "ADAPTATION in the clearing of BEYNG" (GA96:33) is now presented as a countermeasure to the idea of humanity as a "rational animal" seeking to master the world in accordance with its own needs and drives. This point is developed in the *Contributions to Philosophy*, composed between 1936 and 1939, where Heidegger describes the thinking that belongs to Dasein not as a subjective occurrence but as a clearing in which "the fulness of the presencing of beyng concealedly discloses itself" (GA65:286). He still affirms that "projection" (*Entwurf*) is involved in the disclosure of truth. However, the nature of this projection, he maintains, is covered up when it is interpreted as representation in the context of a subject–object relation. The original "projection" that enables things to show up for our understanding is the clearing, the basic disclosure within which "correctness" is measured. Heidegger adds that "if truth here means the *clearing* of being as openness in the midst of what-is, then the truth of this truth cannot be questioned" (GA65:327).

Given the historical character of the clearing within Heidegger's later thought, where different historical epochs are characterized by different basic views of humanity and being, the idea can be seen as supporting anti-realism. Lee Braver, in line with his anti-realist reading of Heidegger, proposes that "this new conception of the clearing as imparting a particular character to all beings of an epoch is the later Heidegger's version of the anti-realist conceptual scheme" (Braver 2007, 263–64). On this interpretation, Heidegger's rejection of subjectivism in his later thought replaces the idea of the individual subject as the ultimate source of meaning, as well as the Kantian idea of *the* subject possessing a universal set of fundamental categories, with that of basic understandings that are given in LANGUAGE and vary between cultures and epochs.

On the other hand, it is noteworthy that when Heidegger speaks of understanding, he always uses language that connotes discovering rather than fabricating, in contrast with, for instance, Nietzsche. The notion of "clearing" is an important element within this language. It can then also be interpreted as supporting realism, serving to counter the modern idea of ourselves as imposing representations upon the world to generate what we call knowledge and acting according to our humanly created values. Heidegger seems to search in early Greek thought,

the sayings of the pre-Socratics, for an alternative possibility to this modern one. In this context, he uses the term *Lichtung*, with verbal variations, in a meditation on Heraclitus' understanding of *alêtheia* or truth, first composed in 1943. On Heidegger's reading, Heraclitus' notion of *alêtheia* involves an event whereby human beings (along with gods) are "cleared" in the sense of both "lit" and set into the "free." They are "alight" (*er-lichtet*, GA7:270/EGT 120), where "the event of lighting is the world" (*das Ereignis der Lichtung ist die Welt*, GA7:268/EGT 118). This event, for which human beings are adapted, brings into the open and reveals; it allows what-is to come to presence.

Thus, Heidegger arguably finds in (or projects onto) the pre-Socratics the sense that, in John Richardson's words, the clearing "is something we undergo, or receive," that "being is not something we accomplish ourselves; it doesn't issue from an act of projection in the strong sense of *Being and Time*." Richardson adds that, for Heidegger, "this is the element of realism in the original Greek viewpoint: the clearing happens by our receiving being, not creating it" (Richardson 2012, 215). It would then also be the element of realism, or more neutrally of anti-subjectivism, in Heidegger's own later thought.

Heidegger's clearest articulation of anti-subjectivism in relation to the clearing and (retroactive) explanation of how he meant the term in *Being and Time* occurs in the "Letter on 'Humanism'" (1947). He glosses the statement made in *Being and Time* that "the 'essence' of Dasein lies in its existence" as meaning that:

> man occurs essentially in such a way that he is the "there" [*das "Da"*], that is, the clearing of being. The "being" of the *Da*, and only it, has the fundamental character of ek-sistence, that is, of an ecstatic inherence in the truth of being. (GA9:325/BW 229)

Dasein differs from other living creatures in virtue of being this clearing, and the clearing is established through its standing in a way "outside" its being. The clearing is still understood as being established by the structure Heidegger had outlined in *Being and Time*, where Dasein has a certain distance from, and thereby relation to, its own being and at the same time the being of things within the world. This distance, which permits an understanding of being, in its actuality and possibility, is what constitutes the "world" (GA9:326/BW 230). The clearing is also the source of language, as the articulation of being. Human beings are capable of language because they have the ec-static relation to being described above, whereas "because plants and animals are lodged in their respective environments but are never placed freely in the clearing of being which alone is 'world,' they lack language" (GA9:326/BW 230). Language is not "the expression of a living thing" but rather "the clearing-concealing advent of being itself" (GA9:326/BW 230).

These ideas have significant implications for the notion of "projection" as developed in *Being and Time*. Heidegger had claimed in *Being and Time* that Dasein's understanding of being is based on projection, *Entwurf*, a term that ordinarily means "sketch" or "design." Thus, he had partially agreed with Kant that knowledge is not a matter of pure reception but involves a "throwing in advance" (the literal meaning of pro-jection, *ent-werfen*), although *Being and Time* suggests that what we primarily throw in advance are not categories determining the nature of objects but possibilities of our own being, in relation to which we interpret what we come across. Given the Kantian heritage of this idea, Heidegger's position could be interpreted as endorsing subjectivism, but this is the interpretation he emphatically rejects in

the "Letter on 'Humanism'": "If we understand what *Being and Time* calls 'projection' as representational positing, we take it to be an achievement of subjectivity and do not think it in the only way the 'understanding of being' in the context of the 'existential analysis' of 'being-in-the-world' can be thought – namely, as the ecstatic relation to the clearing of being" (GA9:327/BW 231). Accordingly, when it is written in *Being and Time* that "only so long as Dasein is, is there being," "the sentence does not say that being is the product of man." It says, rather, that "only so long as the clearing of being occurs (propriates) does being convey itself to man" (GA9:336/BW 240). Consequently, "what throws in projection is not man but being itself, which sends man into the ek-sistence of Da-sein that is his essence ... this destiny occurs/propriates as the clearing of being – which it is" (GA9:357/BW 241). And it does so in the form of language, as that in which being has its home: "being comes, clearing itself, to language," and "thinking attends to the clearing of being in that it puts its saying of being into language" (GA9:361/BW 262).

A couple of years later, in the "Introduction" to "What is Metaphysics?" (1949), Heidegger makes the further point that the clearing, the lighting of self and world that Dasein always brings with it, is prior to the kind of reflective determination of the essence of things that characterizes metaphysics, although it is not thematized by metaphysical inquiry. "Wherever metaphysics represents entities," Heidegger writes, "being has been cleared." It has "arrived in a state of unconcealedness (Ἀλήθεια)," so that it always "speaks from out of the unnoticed manifestness of being" (GA9:366/BW 278).

Increasingly, moreover, Heidegger's attempt to articulate the primordiality or basicness of the clearing leads him to reject earlier equations between *Lichtung* and "light" as well as "truth." Dahlstrom points out this shift in the connotations of clearing over the course of Heidegger's writings, noting that "when Heidegger turns to his account of the clearing as the truth, not primarily of Dasein, but of being, he drops the association with light in favor of the normal use of the term for a fortuitous opening in a forest" (Dahlstrom 2007, 70; cf. Capobianco 2010, 87–103). Now the clearing is that within which things present and absent themselves so that Dasein may take note of them. It is then prior to the *lumen naturale* (Dahlstrom 2007, 69) and lies within the power of being, not Dasein.

By the time we reach the very late work, "The End of Philosophy and the Task of Thinking," Heidegger goes so far as to say: "what is light in the sense of being free and open has nothing in common with the adjective 'light' which means 'bright,' neither linguistically nor materially" (GA14:80/BW 441–42). That is because light presupposes the "primal phenomenon" (GA14:81/BW 442) of the clearing, which "is not only free for brightness and darkness but also for resonance and echo, for sound and the diminishing of sound" (GA14:81/BW 442). Philosophy does not pay attention to this "free openness" presupposed by the "lumen naturale, the light of reason"; the latter does not create but "throws light only on the open" (GA14:81, 82/BW 442, 443). Even darkness needs the clearing, after all, since we happen upon darkness and "wander through it" (GA14:83/BW 444). Likewise, the clearing is more basic than evidence, correspondence, or correctness, as all such processes of discovery and verification presuppose the openness through which we have our primary access to things. "For this reason," Heidegger now thinks, "it was immaterial and therefore misleading to call *alêtheia*, in the sense of clearing, 'truth'" (GA14:86/BW 446–47).

The matter at issue here is a kind of break within being which establishes the distinction between being and thinking. What makes human beings the special kind of entity that they are is

that they are the site of this break. Released from immersion within their immediate needs and environment, they stand at a distance from what-is so as to be able to apprehend it and respond in a thoughtful manner. Thus, "the quiet heart of the clearing is the place of stillness from which alone the possibility of the belonging together of being and thinking, that is, presence and apprehending, can arise at all" (GA14:84/BW 445).

The clearing, the distance from things that enables us to experience their nearness, is therefore the ultimate source of our capacity to name, wonder, question, and imagine.

Heidegger's final reference to the clearing occurs in "On the Question Concerning the Determination of the Matter for Thinking," the first version of which was delivered as a talk in 1965 (see Capobianco and Göbel's translation for a history of this work; Heidegger 2010, 213). It reiterates the disassociation of clearing from light, connecting the term instead with freeing from obstructions, "lightening" in the sense of making light. Heidegger uses the metaphor of raising an anchor: "to raise [*lichten*] the anchor says as much: to free it from the encompassing ocean floor and lift it into the free of water and air" (GA16:630/QDMT 220). Again, Heidegger proposes that this freeing is what establishes the character of the entity he had called Dasein in *Being and Time*. He also adds a clarification (or a revision, depending on how one sees this matter): "the Dasein is the clearing for presence as such, and yet Dasein is, at the same time, certainly not the clearing insofar as the clearing is Dasein in the first place, that is, insofar as the clearing grants Dasein as such" (GA16:631/QDMT 221). The clearing then grants the temporality and spatiality proper to Dasein (GA16:631/QDMT 221), which are the preconditions for its apprehension of what-is.

In sum, the semantic content, or at least emphasis, of the term *Lichtung* shifts from illumination to freeing over the course of Heidegger's writings, and in the later works Dasein is said to depend on the clearing rather than the other way around. Nonetheless, there is a fundamental continuity of meaning as well, in that the term always points toward the special relation to being that opens access to the being of entities and makes human understanding possible. The clearing is and remains the bounded space of the world within which such understanding occurs.

Sonia Sikka

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA14:35–37; GA15:229–37/HS 141–47; GA45:209–13; QDMT

FURTHER READING

Braver 2007, Capobianco 2010, Dahlstrom 2007, Dreyfus 1991, May 1996, Richardson 2012, Richardson 1963, Wrathall 2006, Wrathall 2011

36.
CLOSENESS (*NÄHE*)

CLOSENESS IS A function of how AVAILABLE an entity is for DASEIN. The closeness of an entity is not a matter of its measurable distance from Dasein. Rather, closeness relates to how far Dasein is aware of an entity, or how attentive it is to that entity. Accordingly, the notion of "bringing something close by'" does not describe the physical act of reducing the distance between myself and an entity, but rather refers to the way in which Dasein is able to bring something close by, by turning its attention toward that entity or by taking that entity up into its activity.

The notion of bringing something close is captured by Heidegger's term "DIS-STANCE" (*Ent-fernung*). Heidegger argues that "'dis-stancing' amounts to making the farness vanish – that is making the remoteness of something disappear, bringing it close [*Näherung*]" (SZ 105). To illustrate this Heidegger uses the example of a pair of glasses:

> When, for instance, a man wears a pair of spectacles which are so close to him distantly that they are "sitting on his nose," they are environmentally more remote from him than the picture on the opposite wall. Such equipment has so little closeness that often it is proximally quite impossible to find. (SZ 107)

Although the glasses are physically close to me, I am not aware of them or attentive to them. Indeed, as many glasses-wearers will be aware, you can be searching around all over the place for your glasses before realizing that you are already wearing them. What determines the closeness of an entity is not its distance from us, but our "circumspective concern" (SZ 107). When I am concerned with something it is said to be close, but when I am not concerned with it, it is far away. Accordingly, dis-stancing, as bringing something close, refers not only to the way in which I can turn my attention toward physical entities in my immediate vicinity. Dis-stancing can also be "a purely cognitive matter" (SZ 105), for example "bringing something to mind" can be understood as an instance of dis-stancing.

Heidegger argues that "*In Dasein there lies an essential tendency towards closeness*" (SZ 105). Accordingly, dis-stance is said to be an "EXISTENTIAL" (SZ 105). Dis-stancing tells us something fundamental about Dasein's spatiality. Heidegger suggests that expressions like it's "'a good walk,' a 'stone's throw' or 'as long as it takes to smoke a pipe'" (SZ 105), reveal more about our environment and the way we orient ourselves in the world than, for example, knowing that it is precisely 4.03 miles from my house to the nearest library. "Though we may know these distances exactly," Heidegger argues, "this knowledge still remains blind; it does not have the function of discovering the environment circumspectively and bringing it close" (SZ 106).

It might seem, then, that de-severance gives us only a subjective view of the world, since "a good walk" for a seasoned hiker will differ radically from "a good walk" for someone who is only used to walking to the bus stop each day. However, Heidegger maintains that dis-stance reveals something fundamental about the world: "*The circumspective dis-stancing of Dasein's everydayness reveals the being-in-itself of the 'true world' – of that entity which Dasein, as something existing, is*

already alongside" (SZ 106). Although dis-stances do not uncover the world in a cold, disinterested way, this does not mean that they uncover the world in a subjective or arbitrary way (SZ 106). Dis-stances reveal something fundamental about the world because they uncover the world as we encounter it and as it "matters" to us as Dasein (SZ 106). As dis-stant, Dasein "lets any entity be encountered close by as the entity which it is" (SZ 105).

Dasein "does" most of its dis-stancing through "seeing and hearing" (SZ 107). As we have seen, concerning ourselves with the picture on the opposite wall brings it close. Similarly, hearing my friend hailing me from across the street brings her close. Further evidence of the dis-stantial nature of seeing and hearing – as well as Dasein's "*essential tendency* towards closeness" – can be found in the drive toward technology that enhances Dasein's ability to see and hear things far away. Technology, Heidegger suggests, "push[es] us on towards the conquest of remoteness. With the 'radio,' for example, Dasein has so expanded its everyday environment that it has accomplished a dis-stancing of the 'world' – a dis-stancing which, in its meaning for Dasein, cannot yet be visualized" (SZ 105). With inventions such as the internet – arguably one of the most extreme examples of dis-stancing in our time – anything can be brought close at the touch of a button. Video calling and social media mean that no one is inaccessible, whilst global media outlets and the vast swathes of information available, mean no subject or topic is out of reach.

However, Dasein's ability to dis-stance the world in this way is not necessarily unproblematic. Heidegger articulates a worry about unchecked dis-stancing in his discussion of CURIOSITY. Here he suggests that rampant dis-stancing may actually render Dasein's engagement with the world less rich. When Dasein is curious it is not really engaged in the world. Rather, "Dasein seeks what is far away simply in order to bring it close to itself in the way it looks" (SZ 172). In so doing, Dasein fails to engage with entities in terms of the richness and complexity of their being.

A parallel can be seen between this mode of dis-stancing and Heidegger's later work of the 1940s and 1950s. In the dis-stancing aided by advances in modern TECHNOLOGY, Dasein is able to conquer remoteness and make everything available. As a consequence, entities come to be understood purely in terms of their usability for Dasein. This is the essence of Heidegger's notion of "STANDING RESERVE," developed in "The Question Concerning Technology" (GA7:17/QCT 17). In this work Heidegger returns us to Dasein's "essential tendency towards closeness," examining more thoroughly the consequences it may have for Dasein's way of being-in-the-world.

Charlotte Knowles

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 102, 103, 105–07, 172, 359, 369; GA20:312, 313, 316

CO-EXISTENCE (*MITDASEIN*). SEE BEING-WITH.

CO-ORIGINARY, CO-ORIGINALITY (*GLEICHURSPRÜNGLICHKEIT*). SEE EQUIPRIMORDIALITY.

37.
COGNITION (*ERKENNTNIS*)

"Cognition" can denote both the process of acquiring knowledge, and the result of such a process, for instance a known proposition. The activity of acquiring knowledge (*Erkennen*) involves different kinds of veridical perception, ranging from truthfully recognizing objects to gaining philosophical insights about human nature.

The German verb *erkennen* is normally translated as "discerning," "identifying," "perceiving," "recognizing," or "seeing." The German noun *Erkenntnis* is normally translated as "cognition," "insight," or "knowledge." There is *no perfect* translation since there is no word in English which ranges from veridical perception of objects to gaining insights. That said, Macquarrie and Robinson's and Stambaugh's translation as "knowledge" is particularly problematic since the verb *erkennen* clearly refers to an *activity* and not to a (mental) state. By contrast, the translation as "cognition" is more adequate (Blattner 2006, 46). After all, Heidegger himself translates the Latin *ad cognoscendum* as *um zu erkennen* – "in order to cognize" (SZ 171). But this Latin term *cognoscere* (and its English derivates) must not be confused with the Latin term *cogitare* (and its English derivates) – meaning "to think." The primary activity that results in cognition is not an activity of thinking, but of (re)cognizing things.

In German ordinary language, it can be said that a person (re)cognizes (*erkennt*) a street sign in the dark, or a friend in the distance. But it can likewise be said that there are new insights (*Erkenntnisse*) in mathematics or in philosophy. In German philosophy, terms such as (empirical) *Erkennen* (cognizing) can be used for referring to the *phenomenon* that we humans are able to perceive objects truthfully. In this sense, the phenomenon of *Erkenntnis* (cognition) is an explanandum, and a philosopher can construe a theory of cognition to explain it. Moreover, *Erkenntnistheorie* (theory of cognition) is the German standard term for "epistemology."

Heidegger uses the term for cognition and its cognates (*erkennen* and *Erkenntnis*) very often: They show up in virtually all volumes of the *Gesamtausgabe* ("Complete Edition"), in some volumes such as GA1 and GA3 basically on every second page. This is partly so because the terms are terms in ordinary language and can mean "recognizing" or "insight." But what is more, Heidegger is extremely fascinated with the phenomenon of how we humans perceive objects. For instance, he scrutinizes in depth the respective theories of Scotus (GA1), Kant (GA3), Leibniz (GA10), Plato (GA34), and Nietzsche (GA47). Moreover, Heidegger says that philosophy itself is "theoretical cognition of the world" (*theoretische Welterkenntnis*) (GA24:8) – but in contrast to all other forms of cognition, philosophy does not aim at (re)cognizing entities (*Seiendes*), but aims at cognizing Being (*Sein*) (GA3:16; GA24:390).

Heidegger's fascination with the topic of cognition stands in sharp contrast to what he has to say about it: He is very critical of most of the work on cognition done in "the tradition." To begin with, he thinks that many of his contemporaries are wrong in taking epistemology to be the first philosophy: According to Heidegger, philosophers should not ask how we can get to know pre-existing objects; instead, they should ask the deeper, metaphysical question what it means that objects show up in experience (cf. GA1:415/BH 61; GA7:72ff./EP 88ff.).

Moreover, Heidegger thinks that traditional theories of cognition rest on mistaken assumptions, a thought which is articulated prominently in §13 of *Being and Time*. Heidegger might be interpreted as holding that the tradition has made a *double mistake*. First, the tradition has projected a problematic interpretation onto the phenomenon of cognition, namely the interpretation that there are two kinds of entities, subjects and objects. The theoretical riddle of cognition would then be how a cognizing "subject comes out of its inner 'sphere' into one which is 'different and external'" (SZ 60). According to Heidegger, this question must not be answered, but dissolved, because the underlying dichotomy between subjects and objects is fundamentally flawed: "No modification of this scheme can clear away its inadequacy" (GA63:81; but cf. SZ 366 and GA1:138). Instead of first presupposing subjects and objects and then wondering how they are related, Heidegger suggests *starting with the relation*, with being-in; thus, he defines "DASEIN" and "WORLD" in relation to each other (see also BEING-IN-THE-WORLD).

The second mistake of the tradition is that it privileges the real-life phenomenon of "a fixed staring at something that is purely occurrent" (SZ 61). Of course, it sometimes happens that we humans stand on an observation deck of a high building and try to (re)cognize landmarks. But privileging this phenomenon conceals that cognition requires activity (cf. GA13:72; GA24:213): For instance, we might best cognize whether a particular hammer is appropriate for our work by giving it a try, and we might best cognize what it feels like to make a parachute jump by making such a jump.

What is Heidegger's positive, alternative theory of cognition? In *Being and Time*, Heidegger offers many resources for a phenomenological analysis of cognition; but most of the discussion is carried out in different terms, terms such as UNDERSTANDING, INTERPRETATION, and CIRCUMSPEC-TION. Apart from the emphasis of relationality and activity already mentioned, the key idea of Heidegger's positive conception might be termed "hermeneutic epistemology": (re)cognizing an object requires a prior understanding. In Heidegger's words: "understanding . . . is not a knowledge derived from cognition, but a primordially existential kind of being which first makes knowledge and cognition possible" (SZ 123ff.). The respective understanding is a kind of know-how, or ability (SZ 143). On a little reflection, the idea becomes clear. Consider an image of a brain scan. A layman might not be able to (re)cognize anything on it. But a neuroscientist with the ability to "read" these pictures might (re)cognize many interesting details in the particular image. Thus, what we can (re)cognize in the world also depends on us, on our being-in-the-world. And the world is not a separate, outer and external sphere, but something which is (re)cognizable insofar as we already understand it.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that Heidegger in *Being and Time* distinguishes between two kinds of cognition: there is the theoretical cognition of occurrent objects, but there is also the practical "handling, using, and taking care of things which has its own kind of 'cognition'" (SZ 63). Against this background, the reader of *Being and Time* must be warned: sometimes, Heidegger uses *erkennen* and *Erkenntnis* in the ordinary-language sense as meaning "recognizing," sometimes in the ordinary-language sense as meaning "insight," sometimes in the sense of the philosophical topic of cognition, sometimes in the sense of his own hermeneutic account, sometimes as referring only to practical cognition, and sometimes as referring only to theoretical cognition. But if the reader bears this in mind, she will (re)cognize easily how Heidegger is using "cognition" on each particular occasion.[1]

Martin Weichold

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Apart from *Being and Time*, "*Erkennen*" and "*Erkenntnis*" appear in all (published) volumes of the *Gesamtausgabe* (without any exception), in some volumes multiple times on basically every page. Of particular importance are GA1, GA3, GA5, GA10, GA17, GA19, GA34, GA36/37, GA47, and GA61.

COLLECT (*SAMMELN*). SEE GATHERING.

COMING TO GRIPS WITH (*AUSEINANDERSETZUNG*). SEE CONFRONTATION.

COMMENCEMENT (*ANFANG*). SEE INCEPTION.

COMMERCE (*UMGANG*). SEE COPING.

COMMUNAL WORLD (*MITWELT*). SEE BEING-WITH.

38.
COMMUNICATION (*MITTEILUNG*)

COMMUNICATION IS A condition or act of sharing with another their common being-with – a sharing that collaboratively makes entities manifest. In §34 of *Being and Time*, Heidegger takes up the phenomenon of DISCOURSE (*Rede*) as a gateway to the question of LANGUAGE (*Sprache*) and an extension of the discussion of ASSERTION (*Aussage*) in §33. Discourse is fully constitutive of DASEIN's being because it is equiprimordial with the two other essential elements of Dasein's existential structure: DISPOSEDNESS (*Befindlichkeit*) and UNDERSTANDING (*Verstehen*) (SZ 161). What is distinctive about Heidegger's analysis is that discourse is also identified as communication (*Mitteilung*), in accordance with Dasein's social constitution as BEING-WITH (*Mitsein*). With discourse, Dasein's being-with is shared (*geteilt*) as an EXPRESS articulation of disposedness and understanding (SZ 162).

When Heidegger says that discourse "is essentially communication" (GA20:362), he is not thinking along the lines of standard theories of communication, which assume a monological model of knowledge and language, where words are signs for subjective mental states that represent entities in the world, and where communication is simply the transfer of signified representations from one subject to another, to be processed accordingly. In other words, communication is only an achieved outcome of language that is originally the possession and expression of individual minds. For Heidegger, however, language *is* an environment of communication that is not grounded in separate individual reserves.

> Communication is never anything like a conveying of experiences, such as opinions or wishes, from the interior of one subject into the interior of another. Dasein-with is already essentially manifest in a co-attunement and co-understanding. In discourse being-with becomes "expressly" *shared*. (SZ 162)

Communication as "expression" (*Aussprechen*) is not a delivery of something internal as opposed to something external, because Dasein as BEING-IN-THE-WORLD is "already 'outside' when it understands" (SZ 162).

The non-subjective worldly character of language and communication can be better understood if discourse is taken in its specific sense as *talk*, or how we normally engage in face-to-face conversation, which Heidegger says is the true core of human language (GA4:40/57–58; GA38: 24/22). That is why Heidegger identifies discourse with *logos* (SZ 32), which in Greek had a pre-logical meaning of public speech. Discourse as a concrete experience of talking is phenomenologically prior to "language" (*Sprache*) in the specific sense of linguistic forms. When we are talking our attention is not on "words" per se. For Heidegger, there is "language" only because we talk, not the reverse (GA20:365). Talking is originally talking *with* others *about* something in the world (SZ 161–62; GA20:362). The social nature of talk also shows that speaking-with others presupposes being open to the speech of others in the mode of listening (*Hören*) (SZ 163). So communicative speech is an intersecting network of talking-with-others-about-the-world, which is not an exchange of mental states but a making manifest (*offenbar*) something in the

world (GA20:361). Accordingly, in *Being and Time* Heidegger connects communication with TRUTH, not in the sense of CORRESPONDENCE but the more original sense of uncovering the being of entities (*entdecken-sein*). Communication shows *how* entities are uncovered (SZ 224) as a collaborative process.

It should be noted that Heidegger's account of talking with others about the world fits a growing awareness of what is called "joint attention," the triangular structure of shared awareness of something in the environment. Joint attention seems to be something unique to humans: infants early in life can both follow a pointing finger to an object and point to an object for someone else's attention – and this phenomenon is implicitly understood by all parties *as* a joint engagement with something in the world. It is this early capacity for joint attention that evolves into learning language as a shared description of the lived environment (Tomasello 1999, chaps. 3–4). It could be said that joint attention helps reinforce Heidegger's insistence that communication should be understood in an "ontologically broad" manner (SZ 162). The triangular structure of shared attention that is unique to human beings may approximate Heidegger's claim that discourse exhibits "existential characteristics rooted in the CONSTITUTION [*Verfassung*] of Dasein's being, and it is these characteristics that make something like language [*Sprache*] possible" (SZ 162–63).

Communication presupposes a "common" understanding. An assertion is fundamentally a sharing (*teilen*) with (*mit*) that points out something in the world, which can be "seen in common" (SZ 155). It is this base of common understanding that establishes the power of IDLE TALK (*Gerede*) which Heidegger lays out in §35 of *Being and Time*. Idle talk is not disparaged but acknowledged as the familiar, ordinary way in which things are talked about, which can block or hide a more authentic understanding and articulation of things that can be made one's own (SZ 169). This explains why Heidegger's later analysis of CONSCIENCE as a call to AUTHENTICITY is separated from the phenomenon of communication. Conscience "speaks (*redet*) solely and constantly in the mode of keeping silent" (SZ 273).

Lawrence J. Hatab

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA20:76, 115, 168, 209, 287, 290, 369–71; GA21:15, 16, 105, 134, 218, 222, 237; GA24:299, 301–02, 306, 421.

COMPLIANCE (*FUG*). SEE FITTINGNESS.

39.
COMPORTMENT (*VERHALTEN,* OR *VERHALTUNG)*

"Comportment" is a blanket term that covers all manner of meaningful involvements with the world, or meaningful ways of directing ourselves to things in the world. Examples of comportments are perceptual experiences, actions, thoughts, beliefs, intentions, fluid skillful responses to an unfolding situation, etc. So while deliberate intentional actions *are* comportments, they do not exhaust the domain of comportments. "Comportment" also refers to things I do or experience without an occurrent mental state in which I intend to do it or register the experience. Thus, comportment includes automatic reflexes, for example, which reflect a responsiveness to the MEANING or SENSE of a situation. The contrast class to comportments are those things that befall human beings, the intelligibility of which requires no appeal to our openness or receptivity to meaning. Physiological occurrences or merely causal events or behaviors – for instance, growing fingernails or hiccupping – are not comportments because, in suffering such events, there is no sense in which I am responsive to a structure of meaning as such.

Heidegger uses the noun *Verhalten* ("comportment") along with the verb *sich verhalten* ("to comport oneself") because they do not necessarily imply that the events they pick out involve a deliberate intention or an occurrent mental content. They do, however, suggest that comportments express a particular practical stance (*Haltung*), a way of being primed and ready to respond to the world. Every particular action or thought grows out of a style or way of carrying ourselves. If I insult my boss at the office party, this action has its roots in my bad or insensitive comportment. DASEIN's stance, its style of comporting itself, is intimately and inextricably bound up with and reflective of the style of its WORLD.

All comportments involve intentionalistic relationships to entities. When I swat at a fly, I am comporting myself toward the fly. When I hear a symphony, I am comporting myself to the symphony (as well as all the instruments, musicians, the conductor, etc.). Whether or not I can comport myself toward an entity is a criterion for whether that entity is "uncovered" or "disclosed" (see DISCLOSEDNESS). An entity is concealed when it is not available as something toward which I can direct myself in a basic comportment or when it plays no role in setting the meaningful structure of the situation I am in. Because comportments are always "about" or in response to something, they manifest a kind of INTENTIONALITY: "comportments have the structure of directing-oneself-toward, of being-directed-toward. Phenomenology calls this structure … 'intentionality'" (GA24:80–81). But Heidegger is at pains to insist that the intentionality of comportment does not require consciousness: "when it comes to comportments, we must keep a steady eye solely upon the structure of directing-itself-toward in them. All theories about the psychic, consciousness, person, and the like must be held in abeyance" (GA20:46).

A primary mode of comportment for Heidegger is the kind of directing-self-toward entities that is manifest in our practical mastery of EQUIPMENT:

> The predominant comportment through which in general we uncover innerworldly entities is the utilization, the use of commonly used objects (*Gebrauchsdingen*): dealing with vehicles, sewing kits, writing equipment, work tools in order to . . ., equipment in the widest sense. We first get to know the equipment in dealing with it. It is not that we have beforehand a knowledge of these things in order then to put them to use, but rather the other way around. . . . The everyday dealing with innerworldly entities is the primary mode – and for many often the only mode – of uncovering the world. This dealing with innerworldly entities comports itself – as utilization, use, managing, producing and so forth – toward equipment and the context of equipment. . . . we make use of it in a "self-evident manner." (GA25:21–22)

Indeed, Heidegger believes it is constitutive of our human mode of being that we always already encounter ourselves in the midst of a world that is uncovered through our comportment in just such practical terms.

Although we are rarely cognizant of it as such, Heidegger argues that in all our directedness-toward entities we are also always comporting ourselves toward BEING: "human comportment is tuned throughout by the openedness of entities as a whole" (GA9:193/147). Elsewhere, he explains that "the understanding of being . . . that guides and illuminates in advance all comportment toward beings is neither a grasping of being as such, nor is it a conceptual comprehending of what is thus grasped" (GA9:132/104). Heidegger illustrates this point: "we are acquainted with the 'ESSENCE' of the things surrounding us – house, tree, bird, road, vehicle, man, etc. – and yet we have no knowledge of the essence. For we immediately land in the uncertain, shifting, controversial, and groundless, when we attempt to determine more closely, and above all try to ground in its determinateness, what is certainly though still indeterminately 'known': namely, house-ness, treeness, bird-ness, humanness" (GA45:81). As a result, "the essence of things," Heidegger notes, is ordinarily something "which we know and yet do not know" (GA45:81). We "know" it in the sense that we comport toward things in its light.

Mark A. Wrathall

FURTHER READING

Dreyfus 2014.

COMPOSITION (*BESTAND*). SEE STANDING RESERVE.

CONCEIVE (*VORSTELLEN*). SEE REPRESENTATION.

40.
CONCEPT (*BEGRIFF*)

A CONCEPT IS A kind of thought through which we grasp a certain aspect of an entity or being.

Like all philosophers, Heidegger continually deals in concepts – developing, defining, and applying them. However, from early on, he questions the relationship between the thinker and the topic of THINKING. When the topic is our own BEING – that which is most difficult to grasp precisely because it is closest (SZ 43) – then clearly we must develop a particularly sensitive kind of conceptuality and language. But the same can be said when the topic is being in general, the being of all entities: this too is a matter that intimately concerns us, since DASEIN is essentially the entity whose very being involves an understanding of being as such.

When the relationship between the thinker and what is thought is so intimate, the thinker cannot conceptually dominate, or comprehensively understand, the "object." The thinking of being cannot simply "grasp" being, but must allow the thinker to be gripped in turn. Philosophy thus needs to go beyond the concepts that are appropriate to everyday interactions with entities, where we encounter things, notice a pattern, and form a general concept of this pattern. This useful, commonsensical kind of concept falls short when it comes to grasping the being of Dasein or being as such, because it does not explicitly put one's own being into question; it does not problematize the status of the thinker (GA29/30:12–13).

Heidegger also avoids the type of concept that is often taken as the ideal in mathematics and modern natural science: a precisely defined concept that aims to grasp the essence of a phenomenon in full clarity, with no obscure remainder. For Heidegger, such thinking fails to recognize the character of TRUTH as an ongoing struggle with an ineliminable dimension of concealment; concepts must be tentative and revisable. The elusive thing to be thought must take priority over the concepts with which we think it.

Over the years, Heidegger experiments with various ways to articulate an appropriate conceptuality for thinking of being. In his earlier lecture courses, the method of philosophy is described as "FORMAL INDICATION." Formally indicative concepts are "formal" because they do not pretend to convey the concrete content of what they are about (GA61:32–33); LIVED EXPERIENCE itself must supply that content. They "indicate," rather than representing and comprehending the essence of what they think; they gesture in the direction of a phenomenon that can always be researched and explicated further. Formally indicative concepts militate against the assumption that a phenomenon has been understood simply because it has been theoretically categorized; they are invitations to the work of "*phenomenological explication*" (GA60:64) and to the existential transformation that such understanding may require (GA29/30:428–29). Such concepts cannot be defined after the fashion of traditional logic; their definition, if there is one, must fall back on a "basic experience" (GA61:19) that each of us must carry out. Because one can always generate new formally indicative concepts in response to the new layers of the phenomena that one's inquiry reveals, philosophical concepts necessarily remain tentative (GA60:3).

Being and Time develops such an inquiry into the SENSE of being. It starts from our pre-existing, vague understanding of the "is," which we possess without being able to fix it conceptually (SZ 5). Heidegger's goal is to grasp the meaning of being "as a developed concept," a "clear" concept that involves "explicit understanding" (SZ 6; cf. SZ 147) and is available to philosophical thought (SZ 8). Likewise, he seeks a clear concept of time in terms of which being can be conceived (SZ 17–18). The explicit concept of being would not be the most universal and abstract concept of all, as has sometimes been assumed in the tradition (SZ 3). Instead, it would require a special kind of conceptuality, unlike that proper to entities (SZ 6).

Despite occasional allusions to formal indication (SZ 313, 315), the conceptuality of *Being and Time* is primarily described as "hermeneutic." That is, the phenomenological method of the text is a kind of *hermeneuein* or interpretation (SZ 37). Following a virtuous hermeneutic circle (SZ 153, 314–15) Heidegger approaches the phenomena by way of "fore-conceptions" (SZ 150) that get fleshed out, revised, connected, and grounded on deeper phenomena as the investigation unfolds. The entirety of the presuppositions of an interpretation, including its preconceptions, are the "*hermeneutical Situation*" that needs to engage with a "fundamental experience" of what is to be disclosed (SZ 232).

An interpretation should not be dictated by folk concepts (SZ 153), even if it must begin with them, and its concepts should always remain flexible. Interpretation can either force the entities to be interpreted into inappropriate concepts, or learn to draw its concepts from those entities themselves (SZ 150). For example, the scientific understanding of every ontological domain is governed by certain "fundamental concepts" (such as the concepts of history or nature); a crisis in these concepts is a positive sign of development in a science, a sign that the science is gaining impetus from a fresh encounter with the entities it studies (SZ 9–10).

When the entity to be interpreted is oneself, then there is a further requirement: "appropriate existential conceptuality" is secured by "the AUTHENTICITY of the ability to be oneself" (SZ 316). Authentic existence involves retrieving the past not as a tradition, but as a living inheritance (SZ 383–84). Thus, the knowingly historical thinker must loosen up the rigid concepts of the "tradition" for the sake of a more vivid encounter with the phenomena that inspired these concepts (SZ 21). Heidegger refers to this search for the original experiences that lie behind received concepts as a "DESTRUCTION" (*Destruktion*, SZ 22–23) or "DECONSTRUCTION" (*Abbau*, GA24:31) of the tradition.

In the final paragraph of the published portion of *Being and Time*, Heidegger still does not consider himself to have replaced "the preliminary, non-conceptual disclosure of being" with an explicit concept of being (SZ 437). Whatever concept of being he may have been hoping to find, it would not have been a definitive and total concept, for he insists that ontological investigations are always faced with the possibility of further, more fundamental horizons (SZ 26–27). This kind of conceptuality knowingly accepts the historicity and finitude of thinking, embracing the position of the thinker as one who participates in a heritage and a destiny.

Later texts explore philosophical conceptuality in a variety of ways. For instance, Heidegger sometimes characterizes the kind of concept (*Begriff*) he is seeking as an "inclusive concept" (*Inbegriff*). This word could normally be translated as "quintessence" or "sum total"; it suggests a particularly rich and heightened grasp of things. Every concept of being is an "inclusive concept" in that it requires Dasein's "insistent steadfastness" (*Inständigkeit*), that is, an authentic

stance in response to the event of being itself (GA65:64–65). To attempt to conceive of the ultimate ground, being, is to stake the human essence itself (GA51:2).

> The *genuine concept* is something quite different from a mere tool for grasping that is used by abstract thinking – a tool that can be exchanged as one pleases and detached from what is "conceived." The philosophical concept is always an inclusive concept, in the sense that it involves [*einbegreift*] the one who is thinking, and thus attacks [*angreift*] him and requires that he be-there [*Da-sein*]. (GA90:235; cf. GA29/30:13, 36)

In German, there is an obvious connection between the words for "concept" (*Begriff*) and "attack" (*Angriff*); both are based on the root *greifen*, to grasp or grip. Heidegger often uses the idiom *in Angriff nehmen*, meaning to "tackle" a problem; to think conceptually is, perhaps inevitably, to wrestle with a recalcitrant issue. He thus sometimes sees philosophy as an "attack" on the things themselves and on the concealment in which they stand (GA34:78, 126–27). Furthermore, to engage in a CONFRONTATION (*Auseinandersetzung*) with another thinker is to "attack" that thinker's line of thought in a respectful yet critical way (e.g., GA36/37:13 on Hegel).

Most importantly, to think is to attack ourselves: philosophy challenges complacent EVERY-DAYNESS and makes us confront the fundamental issues, shaking our comfortable opinions (GA34:157; GA36/37:233). For example, philosophical reflection on human FREEDOM has an "aggressive character" (GA31:26). This element is obscured if we take philosophy as pure theory or speculation; even when it concerns universal and abstract questions about entities as a whole, philosophy is never mere contemplation but is properly a provocation that forces us to reconsider ourselves (GA31:35–36, 55, 123, 127). Thus,

> in the philosophical concept, man, and indeed man as a whole, is in the *grip of an attack* – driven out of everydayness and driven back into the ground of things. . . . *[I]n philosophizing the Da-sein in man launches the attack upon man*. Thus man in the ground of his essence is someone in the grip of an attack [*ein Angegriffener und Ergriffener*], attacked by the fact "that he is what he is," and already caught up [*miteinbegriffen*] in all comprehending [*begreifende*] questioning. (GA29/30:31)

But there is a very different and less admirable form of "attack" at work in the concepts of modern science and TECHNOLOGY, according to Heidegger. Modern thought deploys a kind of conceptuality that aims at perfectly representing and thus controlling entities. Descartes' "clear and distinct ideas" go hand in hand with his goal of elevating human beings to the rank of "masters and possessors of nature." Unlike Heideggerian concepts, which aim to preserve and intensify the "question-worthiness" of phenomena, modern concepts aim to explain phenomena in terms of simpler, clearer elements. Such explaining is, for Heidegger, the very opposite of understanding (GA39:246–47).

Modern conceptuality objectifies things, demanding that they appear within the perspective of representational grasping. REPRESENTATION (*Vorstellung*) literally "sets entities in front of" the conceiving mind so that they can be calculated and dominated. This is a hostile attack on things, or an invasion (*Eingriff*, GA9:402/304; GA54:5). The thing is not allowed to be a thing, but is reduced to an object. In the age of technology, entities are conceptually and practically conquered for the sake of our willful self-assertion (GA76:288), becoming something still more pliable than objects: "STANDING RESERVE" or resources. Heidegger suggests that nature itself may defend itself against such a reduction to natural resources by releasing

forces that lead to the "annihilation" (not the destruction) of the essence of the human will (GA77:17–20, 157).

Heidegger's mode of thinking can be characterized from the outside as "mystical," "unscientific," "poetic," or "irrational" because of the elusive and inexact concepts he employs. However, a just criticism must consider the fact that he has chosen this kind of conceptuality deliberately, in order to address fundamental questions about being and our relation to it. Exactness, he would argue, is not necessarily rigor; the most rigorous thinking about being may be a kind of thinking that abandons the presumption of conceptual exactitude.

Richard Polt

FURTHER READING

Adrián Escudero 2014, Burch 2013, Dahlstrom 1994, Glazebrook 2000, Kisiel 1995, MacAvoy 2010, McNeill 1999, Rouse 2005, Herrmann 2013

CONCEPTION (*VORSTELLUNG*). SEE REPRESENTATION.

CONCERN (*SORGE*). SEE CARE.

41.
CONFRONTATION
(*AUSEINANDERSETZUNG*)

Confrontation is a method that achieves an understanding of one thing by examining it in its opposition to another. In everyday German, *Auseinandersetzung* has a range of meanings relating to dispute: from friendly but vigorous discussion, to hostile argument, to physical altercation. In Heidegger's philosophical usage, *Auseinandersetzung* or "confrontation" has two principal meanings. One is as a hermeneutical principle, particularly for authors Heidegger respects, even when he disagrees with them, and also more broadly for the hermeneutical situation in which DASEIN exists in the world. The other is as the predominant German word he employs to translate the Greek *polemos* as a philosophical term, particularly in Heraclitus (see POLEMOS). These two usages, hermeneutical and terminological, are linked.

As a hermeneutical principle, confrontation appears as early as 1922 to describe the task of philosophy, both in the interpretation of factical life (GA62:76–77) and in the interpretation of previous philosophy: "for philosophical research, the destructive confrontation with its history is no mere annex with the goal of illustrating how it was in the past"; rather, confrontation as DESTRUCTION seeks to understand how the present can take up, transform, and appropriate questions and possibilities left unthought in historical figures (GA62:368). This reflects what Heidegger understands as the purpose of the phenomenological analysis of facticity for the interpretation of life itself, what he will later come to call Dasein's hermeneutical existence, and so it is not merely a way of doing academic history of philosophy. The "destructive" element in hermeneutical confrontation is not a heedless annihilation of what is being interpreted, in authors or in life, but rather a deconstruction, a reading that breaks down a text or a given situation, not to destroy meaning but to explore neglected questions and unfulfilled potentialities.

By the 1930s, Heidegger uses confrontation even more precisely as the hermeneutical probity needed to interpret the work of other thinkers. In particular, he describes his long engagement with Nietzsche, beginning in the mid-1930s, as a confrontation both with that thinker and with the entire history of Western philosophy, which he sees as culminating and exhausting itself in NIHILISM with Nietzsche (GA43:5). Heidegger summarizes the hermeneutic principle as follows: "confrontation does not express itself in 'polemic' but rather in the manner of interpretive construction, of the placement of the antagonist in his most potent and most dangerous position" (GA43:279). In reading another author seriously, especially in disagreeing, one does not seek to win an argument by nit-picking and fault-finding; instead, the goal is to interpret the opponent in such a way as to challenge oneself as deeply as possible so that the fundamental questions at issue emerge.

Because Dasein is itself hermeneutic for Heidegger, ever faced with confronting its THROWNNESS, interpreting its situation, and appropriating possibilities of its past for the sake of its future, "confrontation" becomes not just a term for the proper reading of philosophers; it serves as what becomes the prevailing translation for the Greek word *polemos* as Heidegger understands it in Heraclitus. Other renderings include *Kampf* (battle, struggle),

Streit (strife), and occasionally *Krieg* (war), but by the mid-1930s *Auseinandersetzung* has largely eclipsed these. Especially in the 1930s, *polemos* serves as one of the words Heidegger experiments with to express the sense of being in his attempt to think past what he considers the nihilistic terminology of philosophy since Plato.

As a translation of *polemos*, confrontation emphasizes the manner in which world becomes and remains meaningful for Dasein. Heidegger sometimes hyphenates the word as *Aus-einander-setzung* or *Aus-einandersetzung*, a setting-out-and-apart-from-one-another:

> as Heraclitus thinks it, struggle first and foremost allows what essentially unfolds to step apart from each other in opposition, first allows position and status and rank to establish themselves in coming to presence. In such a stepping-apart, clefts, intervals, distances and joints open themselves up. In *Aus-einandersetzung*, world comes to be. [*Auseinandersetzung* does not divide unity, much less destroy it. It builds unity; it is the gathering (*logos*). *Polemos* and *logos* are the same.] (GA40:66/65; Heidegger's brackets)

The *Aus-einander-*, the out-and-apart-from-one-another, articulates the differentiation and distinctness of entities, their delimitation as bounded, so that they may be intelligible to Dasein in a meaningful world. The *-setzung* indicates a positing, a setting forth or out of entities into a WORLD as an articulated whole, not just an accumulation of separate entities in an undifferentiated clutter (see GA5:21/16). For Heidegger, a world's meaning cannot be established, set forth or set down, without the ontological confrontation of *Aus-einander-setzung* that differentiates (*polemos*) and gathers into a unifying whole or identity (*logos*).

As the hermeneutical being, the being that interprets its own being on the basis of its TEMPORALITY and its being given over to realms of meaning that are open to it but also open to question, Dasein itself is the locus of confrontation. The temporal structure of Dasein's existence is a confrontation with Dasein's being as essentially historical. Dasein as Da-sein, as the nexus between temporal situatedness and being, must engage in this confrontation with the meaning of the given world: "Only where being opens itself up in questioning does history happen, and with it that being of the human being by virtue of which the human being ventures the confrontation with entities as such" (GA40:152/152–53). Heidegger suggests that being needs Dasein to engage in this confrontation with it, or else the world calcifies and meaning, as essentially open to ongoing interpretive reconstruction, fades (GA40:67/66, 187/190).

In a parallel to his contention in *Being and Time* that the fate of individual Dasein is bound up with the destiny of a historical people through "communication and struggle" (SZ 384), Heidegger also claims that the confrontational engagement with the meaning of its world is not restricted to individual Dasein but also defines the overarching history of the West as a whole. In *Contributions to Philosophy* and other works of the mid-1930s and later, Heidegger describes an "*Auseinandersetzung* between the first and the other inception" to history (GA65:176–88 and *passim*). In this monumental *Auseinandersetzung*, thinking must confront and retrieve what was obscured and forgotten in the first inception, namely, the *Ereignis*, the openedness of being in its truth to Dasein, because of the rise of Plato's theory of ideas as the dominant interpretation of being (GA65:211). In confrontation with the metaphysics of Platonism, the other beginning would retrieve possibilities for thought and for Dasein implicit

in but never fully realized by the earlier Greek philosophers who were eclipsed by Plato. For Heidegger, then, confrontation embraces both the hermeneutical task of individual Dasein's interpretive existence and the defining task facing Dasein collectively as the inheritor of a Western tradition in crisis.

Gregory Fried

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 169; GA9:409/309, 424/320; GA13:19–21; GA17:2–3; GA36/37:13, 78, 87, 90, 92, 94fn., 114, 177, 184–85, 187, 233, 270, 277–80; GA39:66, 134; GA40:66–67/64–66, 121/119–20, 140/139–40, 152–53/153, 158/159, 175/177; GA43:279; GA47:174, 206; GA61:2, 102, 154, 179, 192–93, 196–97; GA65:31, 55, 58–59, 144, 186–88, 198, 221, 229, 271, 434, 482; GA66:48, 66, 69, 74–80, 87, 275, 308, 362, 420, 424–25; GA69:161–62; GA73.1:50, 77, 80; GA90:105, 174, 253–54, 356, 427; GA94:20, 46, 129, 140, 143; GA95:12, 401, 417; GA96:41–42, 64–65, 148, 179, 255, 274

FURTHER READING

Fried 2000, Keck and Jovanov 2013, Milchman and Rosenberg 2003

CONJUNCTURE (*FUGE*). SEE FITTINGNESS.

42.

CONSCIENCE (*GEWISSEN*)

Conscience is "the call of care from the uncanniness of being-in-the-world – the call which summons Dasein to its ownmost ability-to-be-guilty" (SZ 289). Heidegger introduces the term as part of his account of how Dasein, lost to itself in the anonymity of the anyone (*das Man*), can grasp authenticity as a possibility for itself. Starting with certain aspects of our ordinary understanding of conscience as having to do with particular deeds and actions, Heidegger develops an "ontological" definition that targets essential features of selfhood. This exemplifies Heidegger's method of constructing "formal-indicating" concepts (see Formal indication).

Conscience is often understood as a kind of inner "voice" that warns or reproves in relation to things we have done or are about to do. Heidegger recognizes this phenomenon but thinks it conceals the existential significance of conscience. As a kind of discourse (*Rede*), the voice of conscience is not a report, soliloquy, or conversation; rather, it is a "call" (*Ruf*), an appeal or a "summons" (SZ 269). It thus belongs to the realm of second-person address. In hearing the call I am not just anyone who might be listening to a report on the way things are; I am *the* addressee, a "you" (accusative) who is called out. The contrasts between Heidegger's existential notion of conscience and the ordinary notion all stem from this fact.

First, a call is not a proposition; it "asserts nothing" and thus neither informs me about nor evaluates the propriety of what I have done (SZ 273). To speak about having a good or bad conscience in relation to particular actions conceals the character of conscience as a call and invites inauthenticity in the form of a desire to argue with or evade its summons. In contrast, the call of conscience bypasses all these particulars – "what one counts for, can do, or concern [oneself] with" (SZ 272) – to address me "unequivocally and unmistakably" (SZ 274); that is, beyond all argument.

Second, conscience calls silently. This does not mean merely that the voice is something that others cannot hear; rather, it means that as a call conscience addresses me alone, excluding the discursive function of "communication" with others (SZ 273). The call does not draw upon the ways in which one's behavior is ubiquitously evaluated as right or wrong in advance by common opinion. In hearing the call, my everyday listening to the judgment of others is broken off, bringing me back to myself.

Nevertheless, since discourse articulates the intelligibility things have for us, the discursive call must give us something to understand. Here Heidegger adapts another aspect of the ordinary view, namely, that of a "guilty" conscience. Understood existentially, my being guilty is not a judgment rendered on something I have done but a "predicate" of who I *am* (SZ 281) (see Guilt).

Ordinarily, I understand myself in terms of my roles and practical identities (father, teacher, friend). In acting for the sake of (*umwillen*) being a teacher, for instance, I exercise an ability to navigate my environment according to what is appropriate for teaching, guided by what is normally done, the norms "prescribed" by those among whom I find myself. If in doing

something that fails to live up to those standards I develop a "guilty conscience," my conscience upbraids me *as a teacher*. As a predicate of the I-am, in contrast, existential guilt involves a self-understanding not tied to any particular identity, and so it cannot refer to the transgression of any established normative order. Instead, it names my relation to the order of the normative as such, a relation that Heidegger calls "responsibility" (*Verantwortlichkeit*). On the one hand, I am "thrown" into a life that I did not choose from scratch; on the other, the call discloses me as an *addressee* of the normative claims at issue in that life and thus as responsible, through my commitment, for being the "ground" or reason of the claims that come to have normative force (SZ 283–85).

The addressee of the call, then, is the inauthentic self for whom reasons and values appear only as established facts. The call undermines this simple realism because it articulates the self-understanding that accompanies the breakdown of what supports it. In the DISPOSITION (*Befindlichkeit*) of ANXIETY and the accompanying collapse of all my practical engagements (which Heidegger calls "DEATH"), the familiar world I inhabit loses its normative grip on me and I discover in myself an "uncanny" (*unheimlich*) possibility – that of taking up those engagements authentically (see UNCANNINESS). It is because existential conscience shows me that I am "not at home" (SZ 276) in any given normative order that I can occupy those orders either as answerable for what they mean or in a way in which I have been robbed of answerability by public opinion (SZ 127).

This also suggests who the *addressor* of the call is. Heidegger sticks to the descriptive character of the experience and refuses to supply any theological or psychological explanations for it. Descriptively, I experience the call as coming from me (there's no one else around) and yet also from "beyond me and over me," that is, as "alien" and unfamiliar, as nothing in the world (SZ 275). To accommodate this description, what is beyond and over me must also belong to myself. If the call calls the inauthentic self to responsibility, then the caller is the authentic ("uncanny") self itself. This is possible because the self is not a substance but something like a performance: for Dasein, what it means to be is *at issue* in what it does. Conscience is possible only in a being who, even when it is "lost" to itself, remains at issue for itself and so can be reached by a call from itself to "own" itself.

What, then, does it mean to "hear" the call of conscience? An appeal or summons requires a response. Whether I turn my back on the call and flee into tranquilized EVERYDAYNESS, or heed the call by authentically taking over being a reason, to hear the call is to be called to action (SZ 294). However, "resolution" (*Entschluss*) – choice, choosing to choose (SZ 288) – is not itself an action, not something I do. For Heidegger, following Goethe, action "is necessarily 'conscienceless'" (SZ 288; GA20:441). Because the call disrupts my actions, acting authentically or resolutely must be described as "wanting" (or "willing") to have a conscience (*Gewissenhabenwollen*): being prepared to be called back to the "groundlessness" of my responsibility even as I exercise it (SZ 288). Reflecting this distinction, Heidegger, in a lecture course from 1924/25, glosses Aristotle's concept of *phronesis* not as conscience but as "conscience set in motion" (GA19:56).

After *Being and Time* the term "conscience" pretty much disappears. But in one significant place Heidegger remarks on how the structure he analyzed in *Being and Time* (willing to have a conscience) expresses the modern understanding of being as will and self-assertion, with its norm of JUSTICE as justification and self-certainty (GA5:243/QCT 88). The "responsibility for taking over being a reason" that the call articulated in *Being and Time* is now understood as

a subjectivism that alienates us from being. In later works, however, one might hear an echo of the call of conscience in Heidegger's characterization of LANGUAGE as the "peal of silence/ stillness" (*das Geläut der Stille*, GA12:27–28/PLT 205), a saying that provides no information but addresses, with poetic measure, us mortals as those who must respond (*ent-sprechen*) if we are to be who we are.

Steven Crowell

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA5:243/181–82; GA19:856; GA20:440–41; SZ 234, 267–301, 309; GA67:188

FURTHER READING

Blattner 2015, Carman 2003, 292–99, Crowell 2013, chap. 9, Dahlstrom 2001, 315–25, Raffoul 1998, 223–35, Wrathall 2015a

43.
CONSCIOUSNESS (*BEWUSSTSEIN*)

Consciousness – the capacity for thought, sentience, and awareness – is not a proprietary technical term of Heidegger's, but it does figure frequently in his lifelong dialogue with modern thinkers from Descartes up to Husserl. As Heidegger says early in his 1923 lectures, "in Greek philosophy there is no concept of consciousness" (GA17:48). Many of his substantive discussions of realism, INTENTIONALITY, TEMPORALITY, etc., are tied to his engagement with modern theories of consciousness (so more may be found by looking at those entries, particularly that on intentionality).

In the seventeenth century, philosophical theories of human being came to focus on the conscious mind and to see it as that which defines us and sets us apart from other entities. Consciousness (which term is cognate to – and, depending on the language, identical with – CONSCIENCE) was often understood in terms of a kind of fundamental self-transparency: the knowledge of one's existence and the awareness of the thoughts, perceptions, emotions, and volitions within oneself. This self-awareness was also usually tied to our ability to have objective knowledge more generally (i.e., to be aware of objects, whether in inner or outer experience, as objects of *our* experience), and to our ability to act intentionally (to pursue ends which we are aware of as *our* ends). Whether consciousness *requires* all this, or whether a broader understanding, one on which animals, for instance, count as conscious, is to be preferred, was and remains a subject of intense dispute. Descartes famously argued that this sphere of self-awareness – which he equated with *thought* or *thinking* – provides knowledge that is *certain* in a way no other knowledge is, and that knowledge of the totality of (finite) things outside of oneself is, by comparison, less certain and in need of demonstration. This epistemological gap reflects a metaphysical gap between the conscious mind and the world, and much of modern thought has been addressed to bridging or otherwise coming to terms with it.

In the early twentieth century, Edmund Husserl, following Franz Brentano (who himself drew on certain pre-modern scholastic philosophers), identified the characteristic feature of the conscious mind as *intentionality*, its being always in each of its acts (perception, volition, etc.) directed toward something (an intentional object, which may or may not be a real existent outside the mind). Husserl then took phenomenology to have as its aim the science of consciousness, that is, a "pure" or "transcendental" account of the basic forms intentionality can take, the development of which requires a "reduction" in which the reality of the intended entities is "bracketed" in order that the form of the conscious acts may themselves become intentional objects and so be systematically studied. In this way, PHENOMENOLOGY is to be distinguished from the empirical sciences, including psychology, which are specific modes of intentional directedness that posit their objects as existing, but do not thematize the intentional acts that are themselves involved in this positing. Phenomenology was thus, for Husserl, a kind of *non*-positive Ur-science, a "descriptive eidetic science of transcendental pure

consciousness" that provided a science of all other positive sciences, as Heidegger put it, referring to *Ideas I* (GA17:47).

Readers of Husserl disagree as to whether his phenomenology preserves or overcomes (or just ignores) the metaphysical gap between consciousness and world characteristic of Cartesian dualism. Readers of Heidegger in turn disagree as to how much his project is aligned with Husserl's and how much it departs from it (which, of course, depends on how they read Husserl). But, whether fairly or not, Heidegger took pains to criticize and distance himself from Husserl and his consciousness-focused conception of phenomenology. Thus he argued that Husserlian phenomenology was driven by the same "CARE" (*Sorge*) for "theoretical knowing," "science," and the "certainty" of "already known knowledge" (*erkannte Erkenntnis*) that steered Descartes and consciousness-centered modern epistemology after him (GA17:58ff.). In other words, an overriding need for and commitment to the *security* of human knowledge and existence forced attention on the conscious mind and demanded it be treated as an object capable of being elucidated and understood according to the standards of clarity and rigor characteristic of mathematics. Heidegger thought this distorted the very phenomenon of mind that was ostensibly being understood: it obscured the fact of *in*security in human existence; it failed to recognize that striving for certainty is only *one* way to care about existence; it missed the ways in which various forms of opacity and hiddenness are necessarily bound up with any transparency or illumination; and it generated the idea that we exist in a "'cabinet' of consciousness" (SZ 62) which we must somehow find our way out of to encounter the world, rather than recognizing that to be minded or conscious is *already* to be *in* the world. Thus, in the 1920s, rather than *Bewusstsein* Heidegger offered an analysis of *Dasein*. Heidegger claimed that "the intentionality of 'consciousness'" highlighted by Husserl is in fact "*grounded* in the ecstatical unity of Dasein" explicated in *Being and Time* (SZ 363 n. 23). As he put it in his 1929–30 lectures on *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, he saw the task of philosophy as thus being "*not to describe the consciousness of man, but to evoke the Dasein in man*" (GA29/30:258). A similar contrast can still be found decades later in the 1973 Zähringen seminar (GA15:382/FS 70), indicating Heidegger's abiding preoccupation with the central modern view of human essence.

However much he rejected the specific understanding of consciousness as a kind of self-contained sphere or cabinet, known first and better than anything else, and whatever short-comings and blind spots he found in the work of his predecessors, Heidegger was nevertheless very much interested throughout his career in many of the phenomena that traditional theories of consciousness were trying to understand. These included, most notably, the fact of the intelligibility of self and world *to* the self, the structure of simultaneous self- and world-relation that constitutes human existence, and the centrality of thinking to our distinctive mode of being (on the last, see especially GA8). His own early methodology was in fact quite close both to that of Husserl and others in the modern tradition he criticized (as is perhaps clearest in his work on Kant in the late 1920s, especially GA3): questions of ontology were pursued by analyzing the basic capacities and structures of those entities who have knowledge or understanding – us. In *Being and Time* he even appropriates the central metaphor of self-transparency characteristic of modern philosophies of consciousness to describe the central requirement of his own analytic of Dasein, that it "make an entity – the [ontological] inquirer – transparent [*durchsichtig*] in its being" (SZ 7). Even as he moved away from this early project and its residual subjectivism, Heidegger always remained focused on questions concerning

our openness to being and entities, questions which are recognizably descendants of the questions earlier philosophers asked about consciousness.

Matthew Shockey

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 62, 363 n. 23; GA15:382/FS 70; GA17: *passim*, but esp. 47ff., 104ff., 229ff., 260ff.; GA20: esp. 21ff., 129–57; GA29/30:91ff., 132ff., 199–202; GA36/37:42ff.; GA46:126, 165, 366

FURTHER READING

Carman 2003, Dreyfus 1991, Olafson 1987, Olafson 1975

CONSIDER (*BESINNEN*). SEE REFLECTION.

44.
CONSTANCY (*STÄNDIGKEIT*)

Constancy is the way we take a stand so that some aspects of the world show up as mattering to us in particular ways. We take a stand by pressing into a certain understanding of ourselves that polarizes the world. The fact that we always have taken a stand one way or another makes it possible for Dasein to be a self, or to fail to be a self (see Selfhood). Constancy is therefore the core of Heidegger's explanation of the self. We can either take a stand that expresses our own choice; or we can understand things and find them mattering to us the way they matter to the average, everyday Dasein. Accordingly, Dasein is either self-constant (*Selbst-ständig*) or non-self-constant (*Unselbst-ständig*).

Constancy consists of being toward possibilities, engaging competently and purposively with the world, and finding things mattering in disposedness. The way the world shows up as mattering in moods, for example, "belongs to the originary constancy of existence" (SZ 340). Constancy is therefore a thoroughly existential notion. Heidegger uses this notion to replace the traditional philosophical idea that the identity of people consists of their being a substance or a subject. Since the main philosophical function of constancy is to explain how Dasein can be a self, Heidegger mostly uses it in variations of the phrase "constancy of the self" and claims that "the ontological structure of the entity that, in each case, I my*self* am, centers on the self-constancy of existence" (SZ 332).

The initial, or proximate, mode of constancy lies in average everyday being-with others. In the modes of averageness, leveling down, publicness, disburdening, and other characteristics of the anyone, Dasein finds things mattering as they do to anyone and understands things as anyone does. This dispersed, inauthentic mode of being therefore makes up a certain way of having taken a stand in the world. "In these modes, the self of one's own Dasein and the self of others has not yet found or lost itself. One is in the way of non-self-constancy [*Unselbstständigkeit*] and inauthenticity" (SZ 128). Becoming self-constant constitutes an achievement of authentic Dasein (see Authenticity). It comes about when Dasein chooses its own commitments on the basis of a sensitivity to the call of conscience that tears it away from its dispersion in the anyone. Heidegger glosses this achievement as steadfastness (*Standfestigkeit*) or having gained a foothold (*Standgewonnenhaben*, SZ 322), in contrast to the non-self-constancy of the anyone-self.

Ständig also means persistent, and Heidegger uses constancy to address traditional questions about the persistence of the self across time. He is explicit that "constancy does not mean the enduring occurrence of a thing" (SZ 128; cf. 320, 322). Nevertheless, he argues that constancy *explains* such persistence. "From it the constancy of the self, as the putative persistence of the subjectum, gets clarified" (SZ 322). Heidegger claims that philosophical questions about the diachronic unity of experiences originate in the dispersion of the inauthentic self in the public world of the anyone. "The possibility of the dominion of this horizon of questioning [i.e., about diachronic unity] grounds in the irresoluteness that makes up the essence of the in-constancy of the self (SZ 390). The task of his existential phenomenology, then, is not to "invent, after the

fact, a unity that links together 'experiences' that occur and have occurred" (SZ 390), but rather to explain the "extended constancy, through which Dasein . . . already keeps its birth and death and their 'in-between' integrated into its existence" (SZ 390f.). Experiences show up as *my* experiences at different times because they already have a more basic unity, which however is covered up in dispersed, inauthentic Dasein. In other words, Heidegger seeks to show how the unity of experience over time is grounded in the more basic "extendedness" (*Erstrecktheit*) of constancy.

The basic extendedness is a feature of originary TEMPORALITY, which is brought to light by an analysis of the authentic, resolute Dasein, which "temporalizes itself as a whole extendedness in the sense of the authentic, historical constancy of the self" (SZ 410). On Heidegger's account, originary temporality is not sequential, i.e., the originary future does not come "after" the past. It is nevertheless extended, because it is "ecstatic," i.e., because it opens up the meaningfulness of the world. This meaningfulness is always taken up concretely by Dasein, which expresses its experience in terms of ordinary TIME. "The 'now' and 'then' reflect the ecstatic constitution of temporality" (SZ 408). The basic extendedness of constancy is this ecstatic extendedness of originary temporality. It explains what ties together the purposes and possibilities that make up the meaningfulness of the world and articulate it in terms of an unfolding sequence. The ordinary experiences of a self, which understands itself in terms of this meaningfulness, play out in sequential "world-time." This is why Heidegger claims that constancy makes up the "putative persistence of the subjectum" (SZ 322).

Finally, with the phrases "self-constant" (*selbst-ständig*) and "nonself-constant" (*unselbst-ständig*) Heidegger draws on the ordinary meaning of *selbstständig* – i.e., independent, responsible, and autonomous – and its opposite, *unselbstständig*. This suggests that authentic, self-constant Dasein is autonomous while inauthentic Dasein is not. This implication is further teased out by the language of choosing and FREEDOM that Heidegger uses to characterize authenticity. Becoming authentic is "choosing a choice" (SZ 268), a choice that inauthentic Dasein passes up. Choosing it yields the "freedom to give up a decision" (SZ 391) and lets Dasein "be free for its ownmost possibility" (SZ 312; cf. 193, 144), while inauthentic Dasein remains "unfree" toward this possibility (SZ 312).

Stephan Käufer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 117, 128, 303, 320–22, 332, 340, 390, 410; GA25:378–83, 387–96

CONSTANT PRESENCE (*BESTAND*). SEE STANDING RESERVE.

CONSTELLATION (*BESTAND*). SEE STANDING RESERVE.

45.
CONSTITUTION (*KONSTITUTION*)

CONSTITUTION IS THE structuring of an intentional agent that allows other entities to manifest themselves to it. *Konstitution* has a mundane use in German, referring to something's constitution or structure; but in Husserl's philosophy, it is put to a specific, technical use that Heidegger appropriates in his "early early" work, the term playing a part in expressing his understanding of PHENOMENOLOGY and its relevance to ONTOLOGY. (How we ought to understand Husserl's notion of "constitution" is a difficult question, as is that of its role in phenomenology more broadly – Dermot Moran going as far as to say that, "In a sense, the whole problem of phenomenology comes down to the problem of constitution," Moran 2000, 164 – but what follows concentrates on Heidegger's appropriation of the term.) Husserl speaks of objects being "constituted" through their correlation with systems of meanings that present those objects in possible acts of consciousness. In several respects, this is an exceedingly misleading way of talking in suggesting, for example, that such systems or acts somehow create these objects. But, as Heidegger stresses in one of his presentations of "the fundamental discoveries of phenomenology," "'*constituting*' does not mean producing in the sense of making and fabricating"; "it means *letting the entity be seen in its objectivity*" (GA20:34, 97).

Husserl's account of our experience of material objects offers an example. Its starting point is the fact that, when we encounter such an object, we always perceive it from one particular side or other, leaving its other "profiles" hidden; but each such perception "points beyond itself," Husserl proposes, to a "horizon" or "manifold" of other such perceptions in which other profiles of that object would show themselves were it to move or we to move around it; consequently, a subject that can experience a material object *as* a material object is one whose perceptions of that object are accompanied by a surrounding manifold of further, related expectations of what she would experience if . . ., a "changing but always co-posited horizon" of further possible acts of perception corresponding to other profiles (Husserl 1982, 107). Such an object revealing itself as it is presupposes then there being a subject whose consciousness can take on this broader "shape"; by doing so, such a subject can be said to "*set up new objects*, [through] acts in which something *appears as actual and self-given*, which [otherwise] could not have been given, as what it appears to be" (Husserl 2001b, 2:282).

One way to understand Husserl's famous *epoché* – which "brackets" the question of whether the entities that we supposedly encounter actually exist – is as an attitude which focuses our attention directly upon these "constitutive" structures of consciousness; Husserl sees this project as making vivid the "ideal system of possible cognitive processes by virtue of which [an entity] and the truths about it would be given" – and significantly – "to any cognitive subject" (Husserl 1981, 11). Such a project is envisaged then not only as contributing to human psychology, but as illuminating what it *is* to encounter such entities, and hence what kind of entities these are. "Something such as a physical thing in space," for example, "is only intuitable by means of appearances in which it is and must be given in multiple but determined

changing 'perspective' modes"; this is how such a thing is "given" "not just for human beings but also for God" (Husserl 1982, 362).

Heidegger too sees our identifying and undermining our "*indifference* [*Indifferenz*] with regard to the manner of experiencing [*die Weise des Erfahrens*]" of the "quite different things" we encounter – an "indifference" of which, "in the . . . course of life, [we] do not become aware" (GA60:12) – as a way of recognizing how different these "quite different things" are; we can "broaden the idea of objectivity" through an "investigation of the corresponding intuition" (GA20:98) – a phenomenological investigation of what Heidegger calls the diverse "subject-correlates" (*Subjektkorrelate*, GA56/57:45) of these "different things." Thus, in the early 1920s, Heidegger uses the notion of "constitution" extensively in exhibiting the "subject-correlates" of – among other things – values, history, the self, and God. (See, e.g., GA56/57:§10; Part 1 of GA59; GA9:29–35/25–31; and GA60 *passim* respectively.) We see it also in his early reflections on the "environmental experience" (GA56/57:70), which anticipates his later notion of BEING-IN-THE-WORLD.

But the language of "constitution" used in the technical, Husserlian sense identified above soon all but vanishes, because – I believe – Heidegger came to see it as misleading. Its associated notions of a "correlation" of "subjectivity" – or consciousness – with a more or less independent "objectivity" – is apt precisely to obscure insights his "constitutional" reflections were seeking to present, such as that the "subject-correlate" of a tool might be "to be occupied with it in using it" (GA20:259), and the "subject-correlate" of an "environment" to be "always 'outside' amidst [*bei*] entities," "dwelling" *in* "a world already discovered" (SZ 62). Heidegger sees a distortion in characterizing these "subject-correlates" as structures of *consciousness* – of subjectivity – their "object-correlates" as anything like objects or things, and the relationship between them as a "correlation."

In addition, constitution was a notion being set to use at the time by others in ways from which Heidegger wished to dissociate himself. For example, Heidegger attacks Natorp's "radicalization of the idea of constitution" as precisely maintaining "the predominance of theoretical consciousness" (GA59:138/106, 141/109). Through Natorp's notion of constitution as *constitution in consciousness*" – which Heidegger feels results in a "non-considering of 'consciousness' from the constant view point of *constitution*!" – "the theoretical relation of apprehension" is "firmly predetermined"; and "'soul,' 'God,' 'life' receive their sense from it," a distorting "thingly-ness in the broadest sense" (GA59:130/100, 133/103, 114/89, 113/88, 141/109, 142/110).

Clearly one need not understand constitution in this way, as Heidegger's efforts to distinguish his own understanding show; but, nevertheless, one might conclude – as I believe Heidegger did – that such terms are better left behind. So in place of talk of "consciousness," we find talk of "comportment" or "having to do with"; in place of talk of "subjectivity," we find "life" and, later, "Dasein"; but what lingers – in an echo of a "constitutive" "correlation" – is a sense that philosophical clarity about the world that we find calls for us to reflect on how we engage with that world.

Denis McManus

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA20:93–99; GA59: Part 1 and §15; GA60:303–11/233–37

CONSTITUTIVE STATE (*VERFASSUNG*). SEE CONSTITUTION.

46.
CONSTITUTION (*VERFASSUNG*)

A CONSTITUTION IS THE composition or make-up of a thing, the structure in virtue of which it possesses its character. When Heidegger discusses the "constitution" (*Verfassung*) of some entity, what he means is the ontological constitution (*ontologische Verfassung*) or being-constitution (*Seinsverfassung*) of that entity. Heidegger defines the *being-constitution* of an entity as "that which determines an entity as an entity in advance, and first makes it possible for that entity to be the entity that it is, and is in a certain sense 'earlier' than an entity and is *a priori*" (GA25:37).

An important claim repeated throughout *Being and Time* is that the basic constitution (*Grundverfassung*) of DASEIN is BEING-IN-THE-WORLD. From the above definition, this means that being-in-the-world is the fundamental structure that: (a) determines what it means for Dasein to *exist*, or have an understanding of its being; (b) makes it possible for Dasein to *exist* in the particular way that it does, or have the understanding of being that it has; and (c) is in a certain sense "earlier" than any instance of Dasein and a priori.

The English "constitution" like the German *Verfassung* is the term for the fundamental organizing structure of a nation or political entity. The term can also refer to the "condition" or "shape" that something is in (e.g., the shape of an athlete), or its "state" (e.g., psychological state). Heidegger clearly wants to use the term in a new, ontological sense, but what exactly Heidegger means by "constitution" or "being-constitution" isn't always obvious. This is evidenced by the way Husserl rejected Heidegger's employment of the term by writing "What is being-constitution?" in the margins of his copy of Heidegger's *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*.

Yet "constitution" is central to Heidegger's project in the years surrounding the publication of *Being and Time*, and is ubiquitous throughout his works of that era. The term "constitution" appears over 200 times in *Being and Time* alone as Heidegger constructs nouns such as "being-constitution," "basic constitution," "essential constitution" (*Wesensverfassung*, 8), "existence-constitution" (*Existenzverfassung*, 43), "constitution of Dasein" (*Daseinsverfassung*, 59), and "constitution of equipment" (*Zeugverfassung*). While Heidegger never provides anything like an official definition of "being-constitution" in *Being and Time*, his use of the term in *Being and Time* is consistent with the definition that he would later provide in his Kant lecture (GA25).

For instance, Heidegger considers Descartes' claim that extension is presupposed whenever we ascribe something to a corporeal entity. According to Heidegger, this means that "extension is the being-constitution of [corporeal] entities . . . it is that which must already 'be' prior to any other ways in which being is determined, so that these determinations can 'be' what they are" (SZ 90). Since the being-constitution of a corporeal entity is extension, other characteristics such as motion and shape are taken to be "*modi* of *extensio*" (SZ 90). In other words, motion and shape come to be understood in terms of (*aus*) extension. This is the sense in which extension is "a priori": only *in terms of* extension can we say whether a corporeal entity has being, and only *in terms of* extension can we characterize any of its features at all.

All of this sheds light on the way that Heidegger considers the constitution of Dasein. Dasein's constitution is not something like a property, which it might have at certain times but not others. Nor is it a "set of ontic properties which constituently keep emerging," which we could come to know by generalizing over each instance of Dasein (SZ 200). The constitution of Dasein is "*a priori* necessary" (SZ 53) and "essential" (SZ 54). With these modal characterizations, Heidegger wants us to think of Dasein's constitution as a *structure*, rather than a *property*. Being-in-the-world, as the basic constitution of Dasein, is Dasein's fundamental structure (SZ 41), and it's closer to a "framework" (SZ 176) than it is to a property.

Thus being-in-the-world constitutes Dasein much like a pattern of health conditions constitutes a syndrome. We might say, for example, that Chronic Fatigue Syndrome, is "constituted" by fatigue, memory loss, and muscle pain. These health conditions don't *cause* the syndrome, nor do they make up the syndrome like bricks make up a house. But it's the display of such a pattern of health conditions that makes up an instance or case of the syndrome. And particular cases of the syndrome can be further characterized in terms of the particular way that they display the pattern. Likewise, being-in-the-world is the structure that shows up in each instance or case of Dasein. Whenever Dasein *exists*, or has an UNDERSTANDING of being, we see the structure of being-in-the-world. And the different *ways* for Dasein to *exist* should be understood as different ways of making the structure of being-in-the-world concrete.

But what does it mean for being-in-the-world to be the *basic* constitution of Dasein? Heidegger argues that being-in-the-world is a structural whole (SZ 180), and as a unitary phenomenon, it can't be broken up into pieces (SZ 53). Nevertheless, being-in-the-world has "structural moments" that we can bring into relief (SZ 176); including "in-the-world," the "who" that is in the world, and "being-in." Each of these structural moments, in turn, have structural moments of their own. By the end of *Being and Time*, Heidegger has compiled quite a list of structural moments that "make up" or "belong to" the being-constitution of Dasein, including: significance (SZ 87), the ANYONE (*das Man*, SZ 129), understanding and INTERPRETATION (151), DISCLOSEDNESS in general (221), THROWNNESS (221), projection (221), FALLING (221), truth (226), and being-GUILTY (306 fn.). Being-in-the-world is Dasein's *basic* constitution because it encompasses all of the other structural moments as the unified structure of Dasein.

Kevin Gin

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 10, 53–54, 90–91, 117, 176–77, 180, 199–200, 221–22, 249, 374; GA3:11–16, 232–35; GA25:28–29, 31–37

FURTHER READING

Haugeland 2013, 91–98

CONTENTION (*AUSEINANDERSETZUNG*). SEE CONFRONTATION.

47.
CONTEXT (*ZUSAMMENHANG*)

FOR HEIDEGGER, "CONTEXT" typically refers to the practical contexts in which we live. The German word translated here as "context," *Zusammenhang*, can also pick out the coherence which is distinctive of these practical contexts, the way they are tied together with these various kinds of relations.[1] Etymologically, the word highlights the way the things in some context "hang" (*hang*) "together" (*zusammen*) in a cohesive and coherent way. These contexts are constituted by two kinds of relations – those that make different things cohere together, and those that make the things cohere with our ends or purposes. Our ends or purposes help organize the context, which in turn shapes the things into the unique entities they are. This entry focuses on two, related uses of the idea of a context – what Heidegger calls a "referential context" (*Verweisungszusammenhang*), and what he calls an "equipmental context" (*Zeugzusammenhang*). But Heidegger also uses *Zusammenhang* in other ways, including the notion of an *interconnectedness of* LIVED EXPERIENCE (*Erlebniszusammenhang*), a *Werkzusammenhang* – a context of everything connected to a particular work activity in a workshop (SZ 75), a context of AFFORDANCES (*Bewandtniszusammenhang*), a context of MEANING (*Bedeutungszusammenhang*), and a context of BEING (*Seinszusammenhang*).

Heidegger's conception of context is tied up with his holistic view of significance and agency. Heidegger thinks we experience the WORLD of our everyday engagement as a referential context (*Verweisungszusammenhang*), a practical context in which our movements gain significance (SZ 75). The referential context is constitutive of worldhood (*Weltlichkeit*), which refers to the distinctive, meaningful structure of practical worlds (SZ 88, 123). Practical contexts both shape and are shaped by our practical engagement with the world. Our purposes as agents affect how things relate or "refer" to each other in a given context and our ability to act effectively depends on our understanding of these contexts. He emphasizes the priority of the whole, "of the presence of the referential totality and of the references over the things which show themselves in these references" (GA20:254; "referential totality" is a translation of *Verweisungsganzheit*, which is closely related to *Verweisungszusammenhang*). Our ability to engage in these contexts, then, depends on our practical grasp of contexts as wholes and, further, our understanding of the parts depends on our grasp of the whole.

For the most part, we engage in a practical context without reflecting on the way it fits (or hangs) together. Although it is organized according to our agential purposes, we smoothly go through our day-to-day activities without explicitly noticing how our world hangs together (SZ 69). When writing in my office, I typically do not encounter my pen,

---

[1] In *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs* (GA20:254), for example, Heidegger distinguishes between the context of reference (*Verweisungszusammenhang*) and the referential whole (*Verweisungsganzheit*). But in other places, Heidegger uses *Verweisungszusammenhang* to refer to the context.

books, and paper as isolated objects; normally, they are already part of a "writing whole," related to each other in a referential context I navigate with ease. To understand the references or referrals that constitute the contexts, think of the way physicians refer, or point, patients to specialists. When I write, the pen and paper refer to each other to perform their unique but related roles, and my computer similarly refers to books, articles, and notes. The shape of these referential relations depends on my agential ends, in this case, to write and to be a good scholar.

Our ability to effectively navigate these contexts depends on CIRCUMSPECTION (*Umsicht*), the engaged sight through which we grasp the referential whole in a way prior to the detached, theoretical sight of observation. Our practical familiarity with the way these contexts hang together leads us to experience the inkless pen, the missing chair, or the broken printer as a "break in those referential contexts which circumspection discovers" (SZ 75). These cases of practical breakdown make the two kinds of referential relations at play in practical contexts stand out in a different way. With the missing tool, we see both "what the missing article was AVAILABLE with" and "what it was available for" (SZ 75). We see both how the various parts relate to each other and how our agential purposes shape these referential relations. Put differently, we see the referential relations between (1) the equipment involved in the context, and between (2) the means and ends, and between different ends. In my office, referential relations of the first kind are things like the way the pen refers to the paper, the computer refers to the printer, or the articles and books refer to each other. Referential relations of the second kind are those between reading an article or book and writing an article, or between preparing lecture notes and teaching, or between teaching or writing and earning a living.

When I am writing and my pen runs out of ink, things no longer hang together in the same way. My writing thus comes to a halt and I see more clearly both the (now ineffective) connections among things in my office and the way in which my note-taking is connected to my scholarship and professional life, perhaps because I sense more acutely the impending deadline for a project. When things go smoothly, the various connections may not come to our attention explicitly. But, as Heidegger puts it, "when a reference has been disturbed – when something is unusable for some purpose – then the reference becomes EXPRESS" (SZ 74); "when something available is found missing, though its everyday presence has been so obvious that we have never taken any notice of it, this makes a break in those referential contexts which circumspection discovers" (SZ 75; Heidegger's discussion of the structure of the worldhood of the world in §23 of *History of the Concept of Time* is also helpful here – see GA20:252–92). This passage highlights, first, how circumspection is the original way I see the connections – as I fluidly read, take notes, and write – and, second, how cases of practical breakdown – when something is missing or is not working – allow connections to come to my attention in a more detached, theoretical way.

It is because we first experience and are familiar with contexts as wholes that when the chair or hammer has been moved, we experience it as missing or out of place in a given context: "Because the specific presence of the environing world lies precisely in the familiar totality of references [*Verweisungsganzheit*], missing something can allow us to encounter the inconspicuous extant thing. And to be missing always implies an absence of a something belonging-here within the closed referential context" (GA20:256).

In his analysis of engaged human agency, Heidegger often uses "equipmental context" (*Zeugzusammenhang*) to highlight the way a context of equipment or tools hangs together. Heidegger famously discusses workshops – involving hammers and other tools – to illustrate how the tools and material of a given workshop are arranged in ways that depend on the purposes of the carpenter or blacksmith. Each tool context is a specific example of the broader equipmental context that makes up a world.

Justin F. White

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 102–03, 109–10, 352–64; GA24:231–33, 414–17

CONTINUANCE (*BESTAND*). SEE STANDING RESERVE.

CONTURE (*AUFRIẞ*). SEE RIFT.

48.
COPING (*UMGANG*)

Coping is our immediate, everyday involvement with entities. It is guided by CIRCUM-SPECTION – an ability to recognize the relations of REFERENCE and AFFORDANCE that are definitive of such entities. Coping is ultimately made possible by a precursory understanding of the environing world (*Umwelt*), which is made up of a whole of such references and affordances.

The term *Umgang*, which plays an important role in *Being and Time*'s phenomenology of the everyday, is translated by Macquarrie and Robinson, as well as by Stambaugh, as "dealings" (SZ 66), while Kisiel translates it as "occupation" or "preoccupation" (GA20:227), and Heim renders it "having to do" with things (GA26:159). Macquarrie and Robinson clarify their translation, by noting that *Umgang* "means literally a 'going around' or 'going about'" in the sense of someone's "'going about his business'" (SZ 66). Central to Heidegger's notion of coping is the idea that, in coping, we know how to handle or deal with our affairs as we fluidly respond to the situation that confronts us.

Heidegger introduces the term, in *Being and Time*, by equating it with "our everyday being-in-the-world" (SZ 66), and designating it as "our clue" to the "being of those entities which we encounter as closest to us" (SZ 66). By following this clue, he tells us, the mode of being of such entities is "exhibited phenomenologically" (SZ 66). Heideggerian PHENOMENOLOGY, then, as practiced in *Being and Time*, pursues the being of entities by beginning with entities as they are encountered in our immediate involvement therewith. Heidegger uses this encounter with entities as they are "closest to us" as the clue to their way of being, by focusing his analysis on the basic structural characteristics of the entities thus encountered. And the entities encountered in this immediate manner are the objects of our everyday dealings or coping.

According to Heidegger, the entities with which we typically cope, the entities with which we are typically occupied, are "equipment" (SZ 68). With this assertion, Heidegger begins to contrast his own ONTOLOGY with that of the entire Western philosophical tradition. For this tradition arrives at its conception of the being of entities by analyzing the basic structural characteristics of being encountered not in coping, but in a theoretical encounter, a mode of encounter in which one simply observes things, rather than occupying oneself with them. Taking the object of the theoretical encounter, the OCCURRENT entity, as its clue to the being of entities, Western philosophers from the ancient Greeks to the twentieth-century phenomenologists, have mistakenly conceived being as occurrentness (see GA24:154–55; GA20:253–54) – an ontology that Heidegger's foregrounding of the equipmental, or AVAILABLE, entity is intended to repudiate. This repudiation is initiated by the claim that our immediate, everyday encounter is with EQUIPMENT, insofar as the encounter with the available is "not a bare perceptual cognition, but rather that kind of concern which manipulates things and puts them to use" (SZ 66; see also GA20:264).

So, manipulating, using, dealing with equipment is the mode of encounter that Heidegger refers to as "coping," and whose analysis he uses as his phenomenological path to the being of

entities. In elucidating the nature of such dealings, Heidegger notes that when using an available entity, such as a hammer, the piece of equipment is "not *grasped* thematically" (SZ 69). That is, dealing with the available is not only distinct from a theoretical encounter with a being, but it also cannot be understood as the application of knowledge gained through such an encounter. For instance, when using a hammer, our hammering is not guided by a thematic grasp of the properties of the hammer, such as its weight, the materials from which it is made, etc. Instead, our comportment toward the hammer is primarily established in using it. As Heidegger puts it, "the more we seize hold of it and use it, the more primordial does our relationship to it become" (SZ 69; see also GA20:259–60).

Although coping with equipment is not guided by thematic knowledge of the entity used, it does not seize and use the available being in a purely unguided, arbitrary manner. Rather, "when we deal with [entities] by using them and manipulating them, this activity is not a blind one; it has its own kind of sight, by which our manipulation is guided" (SZ 69). This sight that guides coping, Heidegger names circumspection (*Umsicht*) (SZ 69). What is sighted in circumspection is a piece of equipment's place in the network of assignments, or references, that is constitutive of the available entity's equipmental identity. In the case of the hammer, its being equipment for hammering requires that it be among other equipmental entities, such as nails, boards, and walls. In this sense, the available cannot be what it is in isolation, but only as embedded in a context of equipmental references, an "equipmental whole" (SZ 68). Furthermore, as equipment for hammering, the hammer is "essentially 'something in-order-to'" (SZ 68). That is, its very identity is determined by the uses for which it is what it is, such as driving nails, which is in turn for, say, fastening boards, which is for constructing a wall, etc. (see SZ 84). Thus, the available is determined by its place within an equipmental context, as well as by its role in the projects for which it is used. And it is these references, or assignments, that circumspection recognizes, thereby guiding our dealings with equipment. Finally, this circumspective grasp of the specific set of references, which allows us to use a piece of equipment in the carrying out of a particular project, is grounded in a precursory comprehension of the total equipmental context in terms of which any specific set of references is determined. Heidegger refers to this pre-understood totality as the world, in the sense of the environment (*Umwelt*) (SZ 66).

Mark Tanzer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 66–74, 83–84, 352–55; GA17:22, 260; GA18:25, 140; GA20:227, 252–65; GA23:19–24; GA24:413–16; GA25:21–23

FURTHER READING

Dreyfus 1991, Gethmann 1988, Prauss 1977

CORPOREALITY (*LEIBLICHKEIT*). SEE LIVED BODY.

49.

CORRESPONDENCE (*ENTSPRECHUNG*)

CORRESPONDENCE IS THE later Heidegger's term for the distinctive relation between the human being and BEING – a relation in which the human being responds to the "appeal" (*Zuspruch*) or "voice" (*Stimme*) of being as emergent manifestation.

For Heidegger, Heraclitus' Greek word *homologein* named, at the very beginning of Western thinking, the "response" of the human being to and along with being as manifestness. His elucidation of Heraclitus' word *homologein* in relation to "the primordial *Logos*" (being) is an important theme in his later work, and especially in his 1944 lecture course on Heraclitus (GA55) and the related 1951 lecture "*Logos*: Heraclitus, Fragment B 50" (GA7/EGT).

His attention to *Entsprechung* as a distinctive term for his own thinking is particularly focused in his 1955 lecture at Cerisy-la-Salle, France, "Was ist das – die Philosophie?" (GA11/WP). He characterizes "philosophy" as fundamentally a "cor-respondence," which he also names with the French word "*la correspondance*." Fundamentally, "philosophy" is our "cor-respondence" to "the being of entities" (GA11:19/WP 69). The English word "cor-respondence" is a fitting translation of Heidegger's "*Ent-sprechung*" because it highlights the always-already "with" (*cor-*) of the human being and being. Properly understood, "philosophy" is a "saying" from out of the attending to the always-already emergence and manifestation of being. Philosophy is not, in the first place, a study and analysis of definitions, assertions, positions, and arguments that no longer bear any relation to the temporal appearing and manifesting of all things, namely, being. Thus, he states that "to open our ears, to liberate ourselves for what addresses us in the tradition" is the way that "we attain the correspondence" (GA11:20/WP 73).

For Heidegger, this "cor-respondence" to "the being of entities" is "the fundamental feature of our essencing," and it is "our SOJOURN." Nevertheless, we do not always recognize it and attend to it, and especially in the present day and in the present form of "philosophy." He calls upon thinking to "fulfill itself" as it had in the earliest thinking of the Greeks by turning away from the mere academic study of propositions and turning toward the "address" and "voice" of being, that is, toward the very shining-forth and manifestation of being itself. "What appeals to us as the voice of being," he states, "determines and attunes our correspondence." If we are able to recall and sustain this cor-respondence to and with being, then our "saying" is full and rich, and, like the ancient Greeks before us, we find ourselves in "wonder" and "astonishment" before "the being of entities" (GA11:22/WP 81).

Richard Capobianco

CROSSING, CROSSING-OVER (*ÜBERGANG*). SEE TRANSITION.

50.
CURIOSITY (*NEUGIER*)

Curiosity is getting entities into one's sight without seeking to properly understand them. This type of sight governs the way entities show up to the anyone (*das Man*) in everyday disclosure. Curiosity is one of three main hallmarks of everyday falling, along with idle talk and ambiguity.

In general, sight (*Sicht*) is a feature of understanding. Heidegger focuses on sight in a loose sense – "an awareness in the broader sense" (SZ 346) – to describe the phenomenology of encountering entities through competences and solicitations. This is a broader and more basic way of intending the meaning of entities than the modern philosophical focus on cognition. Our practical competences disclose entities as tool-like, available equipment that we can skillfully grasp and put to use. Equipment shows up in circumspection (*Umsicht*). In our dealings with entities we also show concern for others, whom we regard with solicitude, or respect (*Rücksicht*). Finally we also hold a view of our existence as a whole in the transparency or perspective (*Durchsichtigkeit*) of disclosure.

The paradigmatic example of grasping equipment shows that we properly understand entities by putting them to use. This understanding is guided by circumspection. Sometimes, however, we step back from active engagement, such as when we take a rest. We still encounter entities, but they no longer solicit us immediately to act. Instead of displaying ways of proceeding with our work, entities show up in more attenuated ways, in the way they look or present themselves. Circumspection has "become free" and is "no longer tied to the world of work" (SZ 172). Such attenuated circumspection grounds curiosity. In curiosity we are "concerned with seeing, but not in order to understand what is seen, but *only* in order to see" (SZ 172).

Since curious disclosure does not aim to engage with the entities it discloses, it does not express or guide our self-construal. In curious disclosure, we are not pressing into possibilities in terms of which we understand ourselves. To the contrary, Heidegger claims that in curiosity "Dasein lets itself be swept along by the mere look of the world, and by a way of being in which it is concerned to become free of itself as being-in-the-world, free of being amidst the nearest everyday available entities" (SZ 172). This is precisely why curiosity is the mode of disclosure of the anyone (*das Man*) in everyday falling. In curiosity Dasein is not its authentic self.

While curiosity does not guide us to engage with entities, it is not an uninterested or indifferent disclosure. It is quite active and hasty, chasing from one novelty to the next. The German term for curiosity is *Neugier*, which literally means a craving or lust for the new. The idle talk, or chatter, of the anyone channels curiosity by prescribing "what one must have read and seen" (SZ 173), so that we can commune with others in an undifferentiated public self-image. We discuss the latest shows or bestsellers; we are interested in them, or crave them, just because they are the newest. But the meaning we disclose in them is deeply unpersonal.

We are driven to such hasty craving by the concern to be free of oneself and flee from the burdens of authentic existence. The objects of curiosity are superficially attractive, and the

business of curiosity grants us many little fulfillments. But its deeper phenomenology is one of unrest and agitation. Curious Dasein constantly uproots (*entwurzeln*) itself. It becomes restless (*Unverweilen*), since it does not disclose entities as soliciting its engagement. It disperses (*Zerstreuung*) itself among worldly possibilities, without truly making any one of them one's own. Curious Dasein, then, is unsettled (*aufenthaltslos*) in the sense that it is not at home in the world. The next new thing can be anything, anywhere.

While curiosity can disclose and discover all kinds of interesting things in the world, it cannot hear the call of CONSCIENCE. The call of conscience beckons Dasein back from its dispersion, back from its lostness in the anyone, onto its own existence. But this call "gives curious ears nothing to hear that could be passed along and discussed publicly" (SZ 277).

Heidegger also uses curiosity to explain the temporality of falling. TEMPORALITY, for Heidegger, is the deep structure that provides the unity of the self and explains how self-understanding can play out in terms of the intelligibility of the world. With its restlessness, dispersion, and unsettledness, curiosity illustrates the temporal structure of falling into the publicness of the anyone. It discloses a future only in order to make it present, and then forgets the present in order to chase after something new. Curious Dasein, therefore, never discloses possibilities that are properly its own, and never finds itself in the solicitations of the world. Its present is always vague and general, but it never finds itself in a present situation that matters precisely to it and that it owns.

Finally, Heidegger contrasts curiosity to *thaumazein*, the sense of wonder that, according to the Greeks, lies at the origin of philosophy. Though superficially similar, the differences are deep. Wonder brings us into contemplation precisely while we do not understand. "Curiosity, on the contrary, is always concerned to know, but only in order to have known" (SZ 172). Curiosity is not only different from wonder, but it actually makes it impossible. Curiosity seems to be typical of the modern age. In this respect, Heidegger's discussion of curiosity suggests that *Being and Time* already conceives of Dasein's disclosure of the world as being determined by historical EPOCHS.

Stephan Käufer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 170–73, 177–80, 271, 310, 346–48; GA17:126–29, 289; GA20:378–84; GA21:56; GA60:223–27; GA63:65–66, 79–80

D

51.
DANGER (*GEFAHR*)

THE DANGER IS that in the technological age, calculative rationality is becoming the dominant, even the only, type of THINKING. The hegemony of calculative rationality presents a threat in three interrelated ways: it assaults human "nature," it regards people and nature as mere resources, and it is unhistorical (*ungeschichtlich*). In the history of Western philosophy, beginning with pre-Socratic thought and through Nietzsche's philosophy, other kinds of thinking were available, until marginalized by calculative rationality in the technological EPOCHÉ or CLEARING. According to Heidegger's meta-HISTORY OF BEING, calculative rationality drives forward the technological age, as the FORGETFULNESS OF BEING (*Seinsvergessenheit*).

This concept of "danger" emerges in Heidegger's post-1930 philosophy. In "The Question Concerning Technology," Heidegger describes the "extreme danger" as "the PREVAILING of the INVENTORY" or *Ge-Stell* (see also SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT(ION)ING) (GA7:29/QCT 29) The essence of TECHNOLOGY or the inventory[1] refers to a "challenging-forth" of people and nature as fungible raw materials to be ordered and optimized (GA7:26/QCT 27). According to Heidegger, "what is threatened especially in the atomic age [is] the autochthony of the works of man" (GA16:527/DT 55). Moreover, he worries that the "rule of the inventory threatens man with the possibility that it could be denied to him to enter into a more original revealing and hence to experience the call of a more primal TRUTH" (GA7:28/QCT 28). The ontological danger is that today people are on "the brink" of seeing themselves primarily as resources to be optimized. However, this "enframed" self-interpretation is not a human doing but a sending of BEYNG. It presupposes the occlusion of our belonging to beyng, in view of which human beings are essentially receivers and disclosers of clearings, rather than engineers of clearings. In the grip of the inventory, yet oblivious to it, late moderns regard calculative rationality as the peak of human progress. The ubiquity of this thinking increasingly "drives out every other possibility of revealing and conceals revealing itself" (GA7:27/QCT 27).

In *The Memorial Address* Heidegger says: "the approaching tide of the technological revolution in the atomic age could so captivate, bewitch, dazzle, and beguile man that calculative thinking may someday come to be accepted and practiced *as the only* way of thinking" (GA16:528/DT 56). This one-dimensional and anthropocentric thinking marginalizes any possibilities that do not maximize control and production. It strives to collapse human distress into social problems that can be managed and controlled. However, Heidegger considers the social and political dangers of the "atomic age" to be of secondary importance. For instance, it is "precisely if the hydrogen bombs do not explode and human life on earth is preserved, [that] an uncanny change in the world moves upon us" (GA16:527/DT 55). This "uncanny change" refers to the smooth, technically organized functioning of social life that covers up (real) human

---

[1] *Ge-Stell* is also translated as "enframing" (see QCT 19) or "positionality" (see "Positionality" in BFL).

distress, "the threat that assaults man's nature in his relation to being itself, and not in accidental perils" (GA5:294–95/PLT 116–17).

The danger² hides in the unchecked illusion of planetary control. It is placeless, everywhere and nowhere (GA79:72). For example, the danger is manifest in the vicious exploitation of nature for profit and lurks in (instrumental) attempts to get the global environmental crisis under control. In the essay "The Danger" Heidegger contextualizes his observations about the danger in a three-level ontology. The essence of technology is the inventory; the essence of the inventory is the danger; and the essence of the danger is "nothing other than beyng itself" (GA79:57). These levels are concealed in the mainstream, instrumental understanding of technology that sees it as a manmade tool, but does not see its "challenging-forth" character.

Instead of having a free relationship to technology, one that allows us to say both "yes and no" to technical use, late moderns are tethered to the use of devices, to the hyper multitasking they facilitate (GA16:526/DT 54). According to Heidegger, we enjoy no freedom *from* using devices and increasingly less freedom *for* a thinking other than one embedded in the use of these devices. As we become habituated to technical efficiency, enabled by easy-to-use, formalized functions modeled on the binary "on and off" code, human thinking mimics these formalizations and contracts. It condenses into efficient sound bites, leaving little room for authentic reflection, ambiguity, or nuanced meanings.

In "The Question Concerning Technology," Heidegger quotes the German poet Hölderlin as saying, "But where the danger grows, there grows the saving power also" (GA7:28/QCT 28). In his appropriation of the poet's words, Heidegger suggests that the danger grows in proportion to the global expansion of calculative thinking. In "The Turning," he claims somewhat prophetically that this danger is underway, but not yet here (GA79:69/QCT 38). The saving power is of a piece with the danger, emerging in a "flash of lightning" (*Blitzen*) "from out of its essence," i.e., beyng (GA79:72), as a granting of beyng (*Seyn*).

Although human participation is required, human beings alone cannot produce a new clearing. Presumably, once we come to the brink of seeing ourselves as mere stock pieces (*Bestandstücke*), we could (somehow) recover our essential nature as disclosers of new worlds, "here and there and through little things" (GA7:33/QCT 33). This recovery depends on glimpsing the ambiguous (*zweideutig*) essence of technology (GA7:33/QCT 33). Heidegger believes that the danger can be averted through acts of deep reflection (*Andenken*), but he remains vague about the details of this possibility.

Dana S. Belu

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA5:295–96/221–22; GA7:19–36/QCT 18–35; GA16:526–28/DT 53–56; GA79:32–45, 46–47, 51–66, 68–77

---

² An elaborate account of "the danger" occurs in the second half of Heidegger's 1954 landmark essay "The Question Concerning Technology." However, the term is already discussed in great detail in his 1949 essays "Die Gefahr" and "Die Kehre" published in *Die Bremer und Freiburger Vorträge* (GA79).

52.
DASEIN

IN ITS TECHNICAL use, "Dasein" picks out an entity, initially the entity "which each of us is himself and which includes inquiring as one of the possibilities of its being" (SZ 27). This entity provided the proximate focus for Heidegger's way into renewing the question of the sense of being, through a "preparatory existential analytic of Dasein" (SZ 65). Heidegger primarily used the term "Dasein" as a technical term during the period roughly from 1925–29 when he was developing and extending the project of *Being and Time*. Heidegger's English translators have almost invariably left the term untranslated, while noting both the word's familiar English translation as "existence," and Heidegger's reliance upon its components: *da*, usually translated as "there" or "here" depending upon context, and *Sein*, being, "there-being," or as Heidegger later suggested, "being the THERE" (GA89:156–57/120) (Stambaugh's 1996 translation of *Being and Time* hyphenates Da-sein). The only two published divisions of that book were devoted to this existential analytic and the ensuing interpretation of the SENSE of Dasein's being, as TEMPORALITY, although the original plan for the book extended further. Heidegger had previously used the term in lecture courses (e.g., GA59:63) as broadly synonymous with "factical human life," and his subsequent technical uses often echoed this sense of the word. In ordinary German, both *Dasein* and *Existenz* are readily translated into English as "existence," but alongside many other uses "Dasein" can have the connotation of a concrete mode of human life, as in "eking out a meager existence." Shortly after the publication of *Being and Time*, Heidegger began to speak of Dasein or Da-sein in conjunction with HUMAN BEING (*Mensch*) such that the former term seems to refer not to "Man" as an entity, but to the being of this entity (e.g., "the Da-sein in Man," GA3:226; GA29/30:31; see also GA9:164/126, 189–90/152). After 1930, Heidegger used the term only occasionally, but often in ways that explicitly referred to *Being and Time* (e.g., GA9:325/248–49). Hereafter I focus on the use of the term in *Being and Time* and other texts and lecture courses from that period.

Heidegger's use of "Dasein" is directly related to the ontological DIFFERENCE between entities and their being (see ONTOLOGY). Heidegger introduces the term to refer to an entity, but to do so in a way that is "purely an expression of its being" (SZ 33). In this respect, Heidegger's use of the term is methodologically determined as a "FORMAL INDICATION." As essentially formal-indicative, use of the term "Dasein" first sets aside any and all of the determinations through which we are familiar with this entity: self, person, soul, CONSCIOUSNESS, ego, rational animal, *Homo sapiens*, and so forth. These exclusions nevertheless follow from a more basic exclusion of any homogenizing determination of the *being* of what is formally indicated, as OCCURRENT (*vorhanden*). The aim is to let the being of that entity "show itself from itself" phenomenologically (SZ 49–63). Heidegger insists that "all philosophical concepts are *formally indicative*, and only if they are taken in this way do they provide the genuine possibility of comprehending something" (GA29/30:425), so in this respect, "Dasein" may initially seem not to be distinctive.

The concept of Dasein, as formally indicating an entity in its being, nevertheless seems to be connected to the phenomenological methodology of formal indication in a way that is not

merely formal or methodological. The aim of *Being and Time* is to revive the question of the sense of being, from its having been forgotten and obscured. Heidegger begins to formulate this question through a brief reflection upon questioning and inquiry in general. Any inquiry invokes what is asked *about* (being, in this case), what is to be found out by asking (the sense of being), and what is interrogated (an entity, in its being). In the effort to make this questioning fully self-transparent, Heidegger identifies questioning as itself a mode of being of an entity, and only then indicates Dasein as *the* entity to be interrogated concerning its being. Dasein takes on this preliminary place in the inquiry *as* that entity capable of inquiring or questioning. Yet when Heidegger most extensively discusses philosophy as formal indication, what stands out most clearly is its twofold intertwining with questioning and Dasein:

> [Philosophical knowledge] is a comprehending disclosure of something in a speci-fically determined and directed questioning, which as a questioning never allows what is questioned to become something occurrent. (GA29/30:423)

> *What philosophy deals with only discloses itself at all within and from out of a transformation of human Dasein.* (GA29/30:423)

Genuine philosophical understanding changes your life, and yet also only arises from within the very transformation it enables.

The extant divisions of *Being and Time* develop the existential analytic of Dasein through a series of interpretations, each grounded in the understanding enabled by the preceding inter-pretations. Heidegger notes at the outset that even in initially posing the question of the sense of being, we already work within a vague, not-yet-articulated grasp of the question, without which it would not be intelligible as a questioning. Since ontology is the effort to formulate this question more clearly, he designates this preliminary understanding of being as "pre-ontological." He then goes on in the introductory sections of the book to identify Dasein with this pre-ontological relation to being, and to its own being: "*Understanding of being is itself a definite characteristic of Dasein's being*" (SZ 32). Yet a constitutive way of being unsettled also defines this characteristic of Dasein's being: "[Dasein] is ontically distinguished by the fact that, in its very being, that being is an *issue* for it" (SZ 32).

Heidegger's first significant development from these preparatory remarks builds upon this characteristic feature of Dasein's relation to its own being. Heidegger indicates two closely related aspects of Dasein's being, "EXISTENCE" (*Existenz*) and "MINENESS" (*Jemeinigkeit*). Existence has to do with Dasein's understanding of its own being as always at issue.[1] Whereas the being of other entities is articulable into its "what-being" and "that-being" (ontological correlates to the traditional metaphysical distinctions between essence and existence), Heidegger claims that in "existing," Dasein "comports itself understandingly" toward its own being as at issue (SZ 78).[2] As a consequence, Dasein's "what-being" is not determinate as it is for other entities, but instead converges with its "that-being":

---

[1] In taking over as technical terms both of the ordinary German words for "existence" (*Dasein* and *Existenz*), Heidegger advances his methodological insistence on formal indication in ontology. One cannot so readily invoke the ordinary, familiar homogenizing understanding of the being of entities any more, because the most familiar ways to express that understanding have been pre-empted. He then introduces another technical term, *Vorhandenheit*, as a way to indicate this all-too-familiarly presumed sense of being, as instead one among many ways to be.

[2] "Comportment" is Heidegger's term for intentional relations to entities, in contrast to more familiar philosophical characterizations of such relations as mental states or processes (beliefs, desires, hopes); the term suggests

> We cannot define Dasein's essence by citing a "what" of the kind that pertains to a
> subject-matter, because its essence lies rather in the fact that in each case it has its
> being to be, and has it as its own. . . . Dasein always understands itself in terms of its
> existence – in terms of a possibility of itself: to be itself or not itself. (SZ 32–33)

Mineness is a structural feature of Dasein's being. It encompasses these defining possibilities of "choosing" to be itself or losing itself, as owned or unowned (*eigentlich/uneigentlich*, more commonly translated as "authentic" or "inauthentic"; see AUTHENTICITY) ways of existing, along with intermediate "average" or undifferentiated modes. Mineness also concerns the individuation of Dasein; Heidegger describes Dasein as *jemeinig*, usually translated as "in each case mine." I will shortly return to this question of how to construe the individuation of Dasein, in considering some of the interpretive controversies surrounding the concept.

Heidegger deployed this technical sense of the term "existence" when he characterized his initial route to reawakening the question of the sense of being as an "existential analytic of Dasein." The phrase is intended to parallel Kant's Transcendental Analytic with its deduction of categories, but Heidegger understood Kant as thereby explicating only the transcendental conditions for the intelligibility of entities *as* OCCURRENT. Dasein's way of being is existence rather than occurrence, and consequently, Dasein requires an EXISTENTIAL analytic, whose structural elements accordingly are *existentialia* rather than categories. Yet these structural features of Dasein's way of being must also be taken up and grasped in an "existentiell" manner, i.e., in living out one's life concretely in each case:

> The roots of the existential analytic, on its part, are ultimately *existentiell*, that is,
> ONTIC. Only if the inquiry of philosophical research is itself seized upon in an
> existentiell manner as a possibility of the being of each existing Dasein, does it
> become at all possible to disclose the existentiality of existence and to undertake an
> adequately founded ontological problematic. (SZ 34)

The significance of this existentiell grounding of the existential analytic will emerge in considering what is required to understand Dasein as a whole.

Heidegger insisted that his ontological inquiry and its existential analytic be carefully distinguished from any kind of human science. Underlying Heidegger's effort to reawaken the question of the sense of being is an insistence that the being of entities "is" not itself an entity. Although this inquiry begins by interrogating a particular entity, formally indicated as Dasein, the inquiry always concerns BEING, which is not an entity at all. To treat the existential analytic of Dasein as a scientific determination of a particular entity would be to collapse this fundamental, inquiry-constitutive distinction. Heidegger claims that any scientific account of human beings as biological, psychological, or social entities presupposes a pre-ontological understanding of the being of these entities, and of the sense of being in general, and cannot provide or substitute for that account. Heidegger does insist that Dasein must be understood concretely as it lives its life in each case, and takes up that ontological inquiry within its life. To that end, however, Heidegger carefully distinguishes the factual determinacy and intelligibility of occurrent entities from the "factical" concreteness of Dasein's existence. Dasein's

intentionality as a kind of doing rather than a having, and as publicly accessible rather than inner or private. Heidegger uses "understanding" as expressing abilities or competences (including its ontological sense as a competence over being, as existing).

FACTICITY, its existentiell uptake of any supposedly determinate facts about it, indicates that Dasein's being is always at issue for it in its very being as having to "take a stand" upon that issue by living its life in one way or another.

To avoid skewing the existential analytic by conflating Dasein with some more specific mode of its existence, Heidegger proposes to begin by examining Dasein in its most ordinary, unremarkable ways of being, its "average EVERYDAYNESS." In its everyday existence, Dasein is typically caught up in various dealings (*Umgang*) with entities. Heidegger approaches this everyday being-amidst (*Sein-bei*)[3] entities as pointing toward Dasein's own way of being as a unitary phenomenon of "BEING-IN-THE-WORLD." Most of the first division of *Being and Time* works out the components of this unitary phenomenon and their essential unity as Dasein's way of being. "WORLD" ordinarily signifies something like a totality of entities, but in Heidegger's use, it is an ontological concept, and hence concerns being rather than entities. World is an aspect of *Dasein*'s being, although it thereby also discloses other entities as intraworldly, i.e., as only intelligible "within" the world. Heidegger first approaches world through an existentiell sense of the term, "as that '*wherein*' a factical Dasein as such can be said to 'live,' in the sense of one's 'own' closest domestic environment" (SZ 93), and also perhaps exemplified by such colloquial English expressions as "the academic world," "the business world," or "inside the [Washington, D.C.] Beltway." The ontological interrelatedness of equipmental complexes (workshops, campuses, capitals, and the like) provides a route to uncovering world, but it is crucial to Heidegger's ontological conception that existentiell worlds cannot be regarded as more comprehensive entities (sets, contexts, totalities, or wholes), but rather something more like the constitutive being-together of entities and the ways of life they sustain. The central theme of this phenomenological inquiry is to allow the "worldhood" of the world (the existential-ontological sense of "world") to be uncovered in and from its ordinary withdrawal, obscured by everyday absorption in dealings with entities.

Dasein itself is ordinarily discovered within the world, both indirectly through equipmental assignments to and for it, and more directly as "others" around us, including oneself as just another other (SZ 153–63). One of the central interpretive problems in understanding Dasein, discussed further below, is how to understand the relation between "others," whose way of being as intraworldly entities is Dasein-with (*Mitdasein*), and Dasein itself, for which BEING-WITH (*Mitsein*) is an existentiale. On any account, however, this initial discussion of Dasein's everyday involvement in the world points toward posing the existential question of the "who" of Dasein, or the self understood existentially. "Who" and world are correlated structural components of the unitary phenomenon of being-in-the-world, and Heidegger's initial conclusion is that the "who" or self of everyday Dasein is not a differentiated "I-myself," but an undifferentiated "ANYONE"-self.[4] Heidegger postpones discussion of the contrasting owned ("authentic") self until the second division of the book.

Heidegger had sharpened the contrast between world as a structural aspect of Dasein's being and traditional, homogenizing conceptions of being-occurrent by comparing Descartes' conception of *res extensa* to the existential spatiality of Dasein. Heidegger draws upon that discussion to introduce a third structural component of being-in-the-world, being-in as such. He had previously insisted that the "in" of being-in is not the "in" of spatial containment, but

---

[3] Macquarrie and Robinson (1962) translate *Sein-bei* as "being-alongside," but this translation is one of the places where their choice is seriously misleading.

[4] Macquarrie and Robinson translate "*das Man*" as "the 'they,'" which is widely recognized as misleading. The most widely preferred alternative is "the anyone," and "the anyone-self" for "*das Man-selbst*."

more like an "in" of involvement, as "in business" or "in love." Now Heidegger further emphasizes Dasein as always concretely situated within some specific locus of such concerns and projects, its "there" (*Da*). That is not a locus "in" space, but an opening or CLEARING that lets entities be uncovered or disclosed in some definite way as mattering for Dasein's being, as at issue:

> The entity which is essentially constituted by being-in-the-world *is* itself in every case its "there". . . . This entity carries in its ownmost being the character of not being closed off. In the expression "there" we have in view this essential disclosedness. By reason of this DISCLOSEDNESS, this entity (Dasein), together with the being-there [*Da-sein*] of the world, is "there" for itself. . . . *Dasein* is its disclosedness. (SZ 132–33)

Heidegger carefully distinguishes the ontic discovery of entities from the ontological disclosure of their being, which "lets them be" or "frees" them to be discoverable as what they are. Dasein discloses itself in disclosing the being of entities within the world.[5]

The scope of this entry allows no discussion of the threefold structure of Dasein's being-in as such, as UNDERSTANDING, DISPOSEDNESS (*Befindlichkeit*), and DISCOURSE. Nor can I take up Dasein's constitutive tension between disclosing and covering up entities in their being, which Heidegger designates as its "FALLING." All four aspects of being-in are not just constitutive existential structures of Dasein's way of being, but they also reflexively inform Heidegger's own project and methodology. I turn instead to the next level of interpretation of Dasein's being. Division I of *Being and Time* ends with a characterization and exploration of the being of Dasein as CARE, approached methodologically through an interpretation of ANXIETY as a basic mode of Dasein's disposedness.[6] Heidegger first introduces care as the unity of Dasein's being-ahead-of-itself (existence)-in-already-being-in-a-world (facticity)-in-being-amidst-entities (falling). In that context, he takes up both how the existential analytic undermines the traditional "problem of REALITY" (the conception of a worldless subject seeking to know an "external" world), and the long-standing conceptual relation between being and truth. Heidegger argues that the familiar conception of truth as correspondence presupposes an ontological conception of truth as Dasein's disclosedness. Only because entities are already disclosed to Dasein as being-in-the-world can Dasein's various comportments toward entities be discovered to be correct or incorrect. This discussion turns on the recognition of entities themselves as independent of Dasein, but the being of those entities as not independent in this way. Dasein's disclosedness is the ontological sense of truth, the condition for the possibility of discovering entities to be in accord or not in accord with Dasein's comportments toward them. Heidegger thus concludes that "'there is' truth only insofar as Dasein *is* and so long as Dasein *is*" (SZ 269).

Division I then concludes, and points beyond the initial formulation of the existential analytic, by asking whether the structure of care as an interpretation of Dasein's being has succeeded in bringing into view Dasein as a whole. Division II picks up at that point with the recognition that Dasein's existing being-ahead-of-itself seems to elude such wholeness. Dasein's being is always at issue for it, until DEATH as the end of Dasein. Heidegger carefully

---

[5] Where one might traditionally argue that "consciousness" of anything also involves self-consciousness, Heidegger argues that in disclosing the being of intraworldly entities, Dasein also discloses its own being. "Consciousness" is not one of Heidegger's words.

[6] Withy (2012) provocatively argues that the methodological role of Angst and its placement in Division I requires recognizing that its philosophical significance outruns its contribution, as a mood, to the possibility of owned existence.

distinguishes death as an existential structure of Dasein from the familiar ontic phenomena of perishing and demise. Death is not an event, but a structural element of Dasein's existence, as being-toward-death. The conjoined existentiell phenomena of being-toward-death, readiness-for-anxiety, and wanting-to-have-a-CONSCIENCE mark the possibility of anticipatory RESOLUTENESS as an owned or "authentic" mode of being-in (as its respective modes of understanding, disposedness, and discourse). Resoluteness attests to the existentiell possibility of Dasein being itself rather than the "anyone"-self, and thereby also of Dasein's ability-to-be-a-whole. This possibility allows Heidegger to interpret TEMPORALITY (*Zeitlichkeit*) as the sense of Dasein's being as care, which was intended to provide the basis for interpreting the sense of being in general in terms of time.

A central interpretive question raised by "Dasein" is how (and whether) to characterize the entity it designates. One dimension of this issue concerns the individuation of the term. John Haugeland (1982) provocatively noted that Heidegger typically characterizes Dasein neither as a count noun nor a mass noun, but instead via an odd combination of singular and plural indications: "*the* entity that *we* in each case are" (although Macquarrie and Robinson's translation often obscures this feature of the German). In that early paper, Haugeland notoriously argued that Dasein should be identified with "the anyone and everything instituted by it: a vast intricate pattern – generated and maintained by conformism. . . . [C]hemistry is Dasein – and so are philately, Christmas, and Cincinnati" (19). Taylor Carman succinctly expresses the widespread scholarly rejection of this claim: "the analytic of Dasein is an account of the existential structure of concrete human particulars, that is, individual persons" (Carman 2003, 42). In rejecting traditional conceptions of human particulars as occurrent entities, on this view, Heidegger rejects familiar conceptions of Dasein's way of being, but not of its individuation as discrete entities. On this reading, just as a hammer remains a discrete item of equipment even though in its being it is assigned to other equipment and Dasein, so Dasein consists of individual persons even though the existential-ontological structure of this entity involves being-amidst innerworldly things and being-with others.

Three broad alternatives to both of these opposing accounts of which entity/ies is/are "Dasein" call for more explicit attention to Heidegger's distinctively *ontological* route to identifying Dasein as an *entity*. First, Haugeland's (2013) own later account incorporates aspects of both earlier views as essentially interdependent, but within an underlying insistence on the priority of ontology. For Haugeland, Dasein is a living way of life that embodies an understanding of being. A way of life is shared by many people, but only exists in actually being lived by them "in each case." "Living" is an existential rather than biological concept. A *living* way of life is one for which the understanding of being that constitutes Dasein is at issue in how it is lived, including the existentiell possibility of resolutely taking over that way of life as "owned." The encompassing pattern of the shared way of life, and its being-lived in each case, are equiprimordial aspects of what remains *the* entity we are, as understanding being.

Thomas Sheehan (2001) and Jeff Malpas (2006) exemplify (but not in quite the same way) a different challenge to the identification of Dasein with either concrete human particulars or the larger pattern of a way of life as lived. Both object to leaving the term untranslated, although they argue for different translations ("openness" and "being-there" respectively). The crucial point for each is that Dasein is not just an entity among others, but is disclosedness, the clearing or opening that lets entities show up as entities. Malpas gives a more topological (rather than spatial) inflection to the there (*Da*), whereas Sheehan inflects it temporally ("apriori

openedness") and modally ("having to be open, … of necessity") (Sheehan 2001, 194), but what they share is the identification of Dasein with the situated finitude of the clearing within which entities manifest themselves as such.

A third approach would extend Sheehan's or Malpas's point more radically by rejecting the very question of how to pick out the entity designated by "Dasein." That question violates the formal-indicative character of the term, whose point is to take us beyond relentless concern with entities to formulate and sustain a questioning concerning the sense of their being. Of course "we ourselves" are the entity being designated, but that indexical formulation highlights the existentiell significance of formal indication. What entity that is, who "we" are, is in question, and inquiry into Dasein as existing seeks to uncover that question and dwell there rather than answer it. That is why the formal-indicative character of "Dasein" as questioning is not merely methodological: "Dasein is ontically distinctive in that it *is* ontologically" (SZ 32). On such readings, *Being and Time* makes no assertions, but undertakes different speech acts, e.g., questioning and calling. The term does not pick out an entity referentially, but instead leaves its specification to whomever can or does answer its call and take up its questioning.

Each of these approaches to the individuation of Dasein also raises further issues. Haugeland's later account calls attention to the relation between Dasein, and other entities that Heidegger characterizes as having the being of Dasein. First, in rejecting the identification of Dasein with individual people, Haugeland notes Heidegger's use of "others" to designate people (oneself included) encountered as concrete human particulars. Any interpretation of Dasein as solely or primarily designating concrete particulars must account for Heidegger's use of "others," and their being as co-existing (*Mitdasein*) rather than being-with (*Mitsein* as an existentiale. Yet Heidegger makes clear that others also have Dasein's way of being as being-in-the-world. Second, Haugeland notes that Heidegger repeatedly characterizes both SCIENCES and LANGUAGE as having Dasein's way of being. Haugeland claims that we should recognize that sciences and languages *are* Dasein (while repudiating most of his controversial examples; see Haugeland 1982), with its full existential structure: chemistry, too, is "in each case mine," as chemists are called to take responsibility for the understanding of being it embodies. Other scholars mostly reject this claim, but in doing so, they raise a central problem: what is the relation between Dasein's being, and the various entities that share that way of being?

This issue first arose for "Dasein" in considering the implications of the existential analytic for the human sciences. Heidegger repudiated efforts to interpret his account as an "anthro-pology," a scientific determination of human entities, yet many have still thought that it sets constraints upon any adequate scientific account, or can expose misunderstandings of our being embodied in some scientific approaches, most notably by showing that the human sciences must be "hermeneutical" (see HERMENEUTICS). The idea is that understanding the being of an entity either *determines* what and whether it is, or establishes norms for understanding the entity (on the latter approach, one *can* understand Dasein as an occurrent entity, e.g., when asking whether its mass exceeds an elevator's capacity, or as an available entity, e.g., when deciding whether to purchase groceries from the cashier or the automated checkout, but in doing so one understands Dasein in a recognizably "deficient mode"). Mark Okrent (1984) persuasively argues that Heidegger's conception of hermeneutics blocks such inferences to constraints on the human sciences: whereas traditional conceptions of hermeneutics invoke a back-and-forth between interpreting a distinctively meaningful entity and interpreting its component parts or aspects,

Heidegger's hermeneutics is ontological, and invokes the dependence of all interpretation upon a prior understanding, without regard to the character of the entity interpreted.

Wayne Martin (2013) has posed similar issues in a more far-reaching way, as a concern about the semantics of "Dasein." How its reference is specified has implications for Heidegger's phenomenological methodology, and the modal force of the existentialia as essential structures of Dasein's way of being. If one interprets "Dasein" extensionally as human beings, intensionally via a characterization of its being as determining its extension, or transcendentally such that its ontological structures are conditions for the possibility of its ontic determinations, it becomes hard to see how Heidegger's phenomenological methodology could justify modally robust claims about essential features of Dasein or its way of being. Martin tentatively proposes instead an "exemplar" semantics, in which "we ourselves" are picked out indexically as exemplary cases of Dasein, and the ontological analysis of these entities is then extended to whatever entities are ontologically similar. Martin's question raises a deeper concern, however, since the question of the modal status of Heidegger's ontological inquiry is not an independent question. Haugeland (2013) rightly notes that the being question incorporates Heidegger's re-conception of what we are accustomed to discussing as alethic and normative modalities.

These semantic issues have often been thought to have implications for understanding the relation between Dasein and forms of non-human life. Intensional specifications of Dasein seem to leave open the in-principle possibility of non-human Dasein, incorporating animals, extra-terrestrials, or computers, however empirically implausible. Heidegger indirectly took up this question in a subsequent lecture course, via a comparative examination that advanced three theses about "world": "1. the stone (material object) is *worldless*; 2. the animal is *poor in world*; 3. man is *world-forming*" (GA29/30:263). Heidegger's willingness to move smoothly among talk of Dasein, "Man," and the "Da-sein in Man" strongly suggests that the possibility of non-human Dasein had no grip upon his thinking.

Although Heidegger most extensively used "Dasein" in the period immediately surrounding *Being and Time*, many interpreters have argued for a significant shift in his thinking around 1930, and often see the repudiation of fundamental ontology and the existential analytic of Dasein as integral to that shift. I cannot discuss these interpretations extensively, but it is important to recognize that any such reading of Heidegger's philosophical trajectory must embody both a specific interpretation of Dasein and of *Being and Time* as Dasein-centered, and of what Heidegger later saw as problematic in that work. The most widespread theme in these suggestions attributes to later Heidegger the view that *Being and Time* is vestigially subject-centered (despite the differences between Dasein and traditional conceptions of subjectivity), will-ful and thereby governed by a technological understanding of being, onto-theological, and metaphysical in a pejorative sense. This pejorative sense is exemplified by Heidegger's (GA14) claim that philosophy as METAPHYSICS finds its proper end in the empirical sciences, whereas his own later work undertakes a thinking that is not philosophical.

Steven Crowell (2001a, chap. 12) instead argues that almost immediately after *Being and Time*, Heidegger explicitly turned to metaphysics in "*metontology*, a new investigation [that] resides in the essence of ontology itself and is the result of its overturning, its μεταβολη" (GA26:199). This was an inquiry into entities as a whole, as a further grounding of ontology, given that "the possibility that being is there in the understanding presupposes the factical existence of Dasein, and this in turn presupposes the factical extantness of nature" (GA26:199). This concern for the factual ground of Dasein's facticity supposedly inaugurated Heidegger's

ensuing metaphysical decade of the 1930s, marked by his renewed interest in the Leibnizian question of why there is something rather than nothing.

A smaller cohort of scholars sees the treatment of Dasein as pointing toward the continuity between the *Being and Time* project and Heidegger's later work. Sheehan's suggested translation of Dasein as "openness" expressed such continuity: "what Heidegger is expressing in both the earlier language of *Geworfenheit* [THROWNNESS] and the later language of *Ereignis* [ADAPTA-TION] is that being-open is the ineluctable condition of our essence, not an occasional accomplishment of our wills" (Sheehan 2001, 194). Katherine Withy (2015b) more specifically locates a continuing development from *Being and Time* into the ensuing decades in the UNCANNINESS of Dasein's openness. On her reading, focused on Heidegger's distinctive interpretations of Sophocles' *Antigone*, the uncanniness with which the human essence always withdraws marks an essentially self-concealing revelation that constantly turns away from its own ground. This essential uncanniness is Heidegger's unwavering MATTER for THINKING.

Joseph Rouse

DASEIN-WITH (*MITDASEIN*). SEE BEING-WITH (*MITSEIN*).

DEALINGS (*UMGANG*). SEE COPING.

DE-DISTANCING (*ENT-FERNUNG*). SEE DIS-STANCE.

DE-SEVERANCE (*ENT-FERNUNG*). SEE DIS-STANCE.

53.
DEATH (*TOD*)

"DEATH" (TOD) IS Heidegger's name for a stark and desolate phenomenon in which DASEIN (that is, our world-disclosive "being-here") encounters its *own* END, the end "most proper" to the distinctive kind of entity that Dasein *is. Being and Time*'s phenomenology of death is primarily concerned to understand Dasein's death *ontologically*. Heidegger is asking what the phenomenon of our own individual deaths reveals to us all about the nature of our common human *being*, that is, our Dasein (and what that discloses, in turn, about the nature of BEING in general). Understood ontologically, "death" designates Dasein's encounter with the end of its own world-disclosure, the end of that particular way of becoming intelligible in TIME which uniquely "distinguishes" Dasein from all other kinds of entities (SZ 12; Thomson 2004a).

In *Being and Time*, our ontologically distinctive manner of becoming intelligible in time (or "world-disclosing") is through Dasein's (purportedly defining) "EXISTENTIAL" structures. In terms of these most general "existential" structures, death has to do primarily with the UNDERSTANDING (*Verstehen*). *Understanding*, for Heidegger, is practical before it is cognitive, and so primarily designates the embodied life-projects we *stand under* (as it were) and understand ourselves in terms of (whether tacitly or explicitly). Existential *death* is thus encountered most directly as a global collapse in our embodied self-understanding (as we will see in section 2 below). But the phenomenon of death also shows up in the registers of Dasein's other two defining existential structures, because Dasein's existential structure always forms an inextricably tripartite whole (Haugeland 2000). Thus, death also makes itself felt in ANXIETY (Angst, also translated "dread," or even "anguish"), which is death's affective attunement or DISPOSEDNESS (*Befindlichkeit*), with "reticent silence" and "CONSCIENCE" as our (authentic and inauthentic) modes of DISCOURSE or conversance (*Rede*) with death (cf. Blattner 2006, 140; Thomson 2009).

In the existential phenomenon of ontological death, our being-here encounters its *own* not-being; as Heidegger provocatively puts it, Dasein encounters its own "nothingness." Indeed, *Being and Time* famously describes the existential phenomenon of "death" in these deliberately paradoxical terms, as "the possibility of the *im*possibility of existence – that is to say, the utter nothingness of Dasein" (SZ 306). Now, at first, the very idea that Heidegger is designating a meaningful *phenomenon* here might sound dubious, even absurdly self-undermining, because it is not initially clear how we could possibly encounter the complete and utter end of our own defining being, the end of that very world-disclosure that marks us out as the *unique* kind of entities we are (Thomson 2004a).[1]

---

[1] The "animality" worry rightly arises here (i.e., the question of whether Dasein is really a unique ontological type) because, throughout his life, Heidegger distinguishes Dasein from other kinds of entities by appealing to our relation to death and the openness to language that this relation makes possible (see, e.g., Thomson 2004a, Derrida 2008, Oberst 2011).

To put the worry sharply: what *is there* to encounter phenomenologically in our own "utter nothingness"? What could a phenomenological encounter with our own nothingness even be an encounter *with*? Why does Heidegger think that the self can *meaningfully* encounter its own nothingness? And what exactly does encountering our own nothingness *mean*; that is, what does Heidegger think his phenomenology of death "discloses" ontologically? (This turns out to be the literally *crucial* question, although Heidegger does not yet recognize it as such in *Being and Time*. On this crucial *turning* point between the "early" and the "later" Heidegger, see "the NOTHING" and Thomson 2015.) What philosophical lessons does Heidegger think this existentially *weighty* encounter with death can help teach us?[2] These are some of the deep and difficult issues with which Heidegger's existential phenomenology of death grapples. (For a fuller treatment, see Thomson 2013, on which I must lean heavily as I seek to go a step or two further here.)

1   HEIDEGGER'S PHENOMENOLOGY OF DEATH

Heidegger famously presents his phenomenological interpretation of death in *Being and Time* (1927), then subtly develops the view in his later work. We will focus mainly on Heidegger's more famous earlier view here. (On its important relation to his later view, see below and Thomson 2011a, chaps. 3 and 7.) For the early and middle Heidegger (and even, I have often sought to show, the later Heidegger), PHENOMENOLOGY is always a *hermeneutic* or interpretive enterprise (SZ 37). The phenomenologist carries out this enterprise by focusing on (at least some of) the most significant structures that tacitly underlie – and so quietly work to constitute and condition – our ordinary, everyday ("ontic") experience of what-is.

The most famous examples of such phenomena in Heidegger's work from the late 1920s and early 1930s include our skillful use of EQUIPMENT, our strong feelings of GUILT, anxiety, and love, our subtler encounters with truth, ART, death, and (*through* the encounter with death) even our most basic disclosure of TEMPORALITY itself (since the existential phenomenon of death discloses "futurity," the first horizon of originary temporality – see below and Thomson 2013).[3] As a hermeneutic phenomenologist, Heidegger seeks to uncover the underlying ("ontological") structures that tacitly condition, shape, and constitute ordinary life in its everyday ("ontic")

---

[2] In *Being and Time*, Heidegger does recognize something of death's *weightiness*, at least as an important phenomenological issue. As I have shown elsewhere (Thomson 2011b), *Being and Time* goes so far as to suggest that taking up the topic of death (and so enduring the *Angst* that usually generates) seems to fly in the face of one of the most basic principles of the phenomenological school, viz., the requirement that we must experience or encounter a phenomenon *for ourselves* (gathering the relevant phenomenological *evidence*, to put it in Husserl's terms) in order to then be able to confirm or contest a phenomenological account directly, weighing in on the issue for ourselves as we seek to make a "contribution" to the field (or to, as Husserl and the early Heidegger thought of it, the "scientific" or *knowledge*-generating communal endeavor of phenomenology as a meta-academic discipline – see Thomson 2005, chap. 3). The problem is that, in the case of death, the principle that we must experience the phenomena *for ourselves* generates "a fantastically unreasonable demand" (SZ 266). We will explore the nature of this unreasonable demand in the next section. It is, however, an even more vexed question whether or not Heidegger reaches the right *conclusions* about death's true weight as an existential phenomenon. For, the conclusions he reaches in *Being and Time* lead him, infamously, to downplay and diminish the significance of "death" as we ordinarily understand the term, viz., as the apparently irreversible end of life, and not just our own lives but (perhaps first and foremost) the lives of others. (On this Levinasian critique, see e.g., Critchley 2004, Thomson 2009.)

[3] I have often argued that Heidegger's "later" (circa post-1938) work also centers around less tightly focused but no less important *phenomenological* analyses of such matters as the way our lives are pervasively shaped by education, by politics, and – most profoundly and importantly for Heidegger – by our historical understanding of the *being* of what-is (see e.g., Thomson 2005, Thomson 2011a).

significance. When such interpretive phenomenology succeeds (indeed, as the very measure of and testament to its success), it *deepens* our understanding of our everyday lives by revealing the usually unnoticed structures that tacitly condition ordinary experience. And by thus making us aware of the underlying ontological structures that quietly shape and condition our ordinary lives, phenomenology often *transforms* our everyday experience as well (in various complex ways), as it does most dramatically in the case of death (Thomson 2013).[4]

I risk rehearsing such a basic point – that hermeneutic phenomenology always takes as its point of departure *phenomena* that we can encounter or experience in our own everyday lives – because that rather obvious point proves to be extremely significant in the case at hand.[5] For, the very fact that Heidegger adopts a *phenomenological* approach toward death means that, in order to understand his view, we need to recognize the sense in which he believes that we existing entities can experience or encounter our own deaths *while we are still alive*. Precisely that point sticks in the craws of many scholars (leading to the large controversy addressed in Thomson 2013), but it remains textually undeniable. In Heidegger's view, as *Being and Time* clearly states (in a crucial passage too many interpreters ignore): "*death is a way to be*, which Dasein takes over as soon as it is" (SZ 245, my emphasis; Blattner 1994). In 1925 (two years before publishing *Being and Time*), Heidegger had already written: "I myself am my death precisely when I live."[6] And he expresses this provocative view even more clearly in 1959: "mortals die their death in life" (GA4:165/190). To understand Heidegger's phenomenology of death, then, we have to understand the sense in which we can experience our own deaths while we are still alive (SZ 234).

As Heidegger recognizes (SZ 236), however, that phenomenological requirement (that we can experience our own deaths while we are still alive) leads to a paradox familiar to the Western philosophical tradition since Epicurus. The apparent annihilation of our individual existences that we ordinarily call "death" seems to be characterized by *the absence of all experience*. (The reasons for this now appear obvious: experience is based on sensations, but death is what follows the cessation of our biological functions, without which there do not appear to be any sensations, at least not for long. Thus death, on this typical and long-standing view, appears to be some final and irreversible absence of experience.) Insofar as we cannot experience the absence of all experience, it would seem that we cannot experience "death" itself. We can experience death in its approach but not in its having arrived; there is thus no experience of "death" itself,

---

[4] As *phenomenological*, Heidegger's existential descriptions are meant to be tested against his readers' own personal experiences, not taken on faith or, indeed, on any basis other than the disclosive power of the relevant phenomena themselves. These phenomena are *always* meant to be personally experienced and interpreted, so that they can be directly subjected to interpersonal contestation or verification, elaboration or redescription. Phenomenology is in this sense thus profoundly *secularizing*, continuing that "death of God" inadvertently begun (on Nietzsche's view) when Kant deliberately replaced God with human reason. (On this point see below; and Thomson 2005, 20–21, and Thomson 2011b.)

[5] In Heidegger's terms, the "ontic" and the "ontological" (i.e., the domains of entities, on the one hand, and of their meaning, sense, or intelligibility, on the other) are never completely separable, let alone dichotomous. Despite widespread misunderstandings on this score, no phenomena are "too ontic" for phenomenological analysis, though the point of such analysis will always be to excavate beneath these ontic phenomena in order to reach the ontological structures that shape and condition our experience of them. Heideggerian phenomenology seeks to disclose the bridges connecting the ontic and ontological domains, bridges the phenomenologist can then travel back and forth on, to illuminating and even transformative effect (see Thomson 2011a and Thomson 2013 for detailed examples).

[6] See Heidegger, "Wilhelm Dilthey's Research and the Current Struggle for a Historical Worldview," in BH 263 (GA16).

ordinarily conceived. (Hence Epicurus' famous maxim of Stoic edification: Should your thoughts ever turn to your own death, simply remind yourself not to worry, since "where you are, death is not; and where death is, you are not.")[7] Heidegger's *phenomenological* interpretation of death – because it necessarily *begins* from the assumption that we can somehow undergo an *intelligible* encounter with our own death itself – would therefore seem to be a misguided non-starter.[8]

In fact, however, recognizing this paradox – that it seems impossible to experience our own deaths themselves (so long as we understand "death" in the normal way) – helps us understand (1) what Heidegger himself means by "death" and also (2) why he approaches the phenomenon in the particular way he does in *Being and Time*, by distinguishing the phenomenon of existential *death* from the ordinary way of thinking about death he terms *demise* (Thomson 2013). Put simply, "demise" (*Ableben*) is the word Heidegger uses to refer to our normal understanding of *death* as an apparently final absence of all experience, that is, as *demise* or becoming "deceased" – or, more colloquially and vividly, as "kicking the bucket," "taking a dirt nap," and so on. Most of us, most of the time (that is, as the ANYONE, *das Man*), understand death *only* as "demise," as that apparently unremitting absence of all meaningful intelligibility which (as far as we can tell phenomenologically, from "this side" of the veil) seems to follow after the final event of our lives. Understood as a fatal collision with (or return to) a cosmic nothingness that remains ultimately incomprehensible (at least from "this side" of the veil, the only side to which *phenomenology* has direct access), demise itself remains inaccessible to phenomenology.[9]

It is precisely here, however, that Heidegger's distinction between ordinary "demise" and existential "death" is absolutely crucial, making it highly problematic that *Being and Time*'s way of drawing out the distinction is so subtle and complex (Thomson 2013). Indeed, a great deal of confusion continues to be generated by the fact that Heidegger uses the term "demise" to refer to that annihilation of experience most people call *death*, and then goes on to use the word "death" to name the existential phenomenon that implicitly structures and conditions our ordinary experience of such "demise." Nonetheless, Heidegger's view that the phenomenon of existential death underlies and conditions our experience of ordinary demise is, in my view, one of the deepest and most enduringly interesting parts of his existential analysis of death in *Being and Time*.[10] For, in the end (pun intended), the Stoics would seem to be right: demise seems to be phenomenologically inaccessible (whether it is our own demise or that of another),

---

[7] For Heidegger's full response to this view, and my response to a related one espoused by Nagel (1979), see Thomson 2013.

[8] As that suggests, Heidegger views our existential collision with death as more of a (sub- or pre-conscious) *encounter* than as a (subjective) "experience": i.e., he thinks of death more as something that strikes us involuntarily than as something over which we can exert conscious control – e.g., by following in the heroic style of modern Stoics like Spinoza (who proudly proclaimed that "the free man thinks of nothing less than death"), or, more darkly, by emulating those Romantic *Sturm und Drang* suicides who followed (supposedly in droves) in the wakes of Goethe and Schiller. Still, as I shall suggest below, the Stoic and Romantic movements left indelible marks on Heidegger nevertheless, in terms of what he appropriated as well as what he rejected. (For a neo-Heideggerian critique of Spinoza's neo-Stoicism about death, see Thomson 2016a.)

[9] Such a collision with our own nothingness would seem to follow ineluctably from the permanent cessation of our biological functions, should we be awake and conscious at the time (Thomson 2013).

[10] Other important aspects of his view (touched on below) include the way Heidegger thinks death discloses the deepest temporal horizon of "futurity" (Thomson 2013), as well as the tragic "aporia" inherent in our relation to demise, i.e., the fact that demise stands as a kind of "necessary impossibility," something we cannot experience and yet, in some deeply problematic sense, must encounter or undergo nevertheless (Derrida 1993, Thomson 1999).

and this is something Heidegger explicitly recognizes (SZ 234), because he refuses to allow his underlying religious *faith* to override the phenomenological evidence that is directly available to us as living individuals (SZ 247–48; Thomson 2009).

So, instead of just analyzing our ultimately inaccessible relation to demise – a kind of phenomenological black hole – Heidegger goes two big steps further. He first analyzes the *structure* of our ordinary relation to "demise," seeking to characterize the sense in which this (ultimately inaccessible) phenomenon appears to us while we are still alive. Employing a phenomenological technique the early Heidegger calls "FORMAL INDICATION," *Being and Time* isolates the six structural characteristics that characterize our ordinary understanding of demise, then goes on to suggest, second, that these six formal structures also come together in a deeper way in order to "define" *Being and Time*'s "full existential-ontological conception of death": "Death, as [1] *the end of Dasein*, [2] is *Dasein's ownmost*, [3] *non-relational*, [4] *certain and* [5] *as such indefinite*, [6] *non-surpassable possibility*" (SZ 258–59, Heidegger's emphasis). These defining structures of existential death are thus *drawn from* a formal analysis of demise, and in this way Heidegger seeks to excavate beneath demise, disclosing a deeper phenomenon – existential *death* – which he thinks conditions our ordinary relation to demise (Thomson 2013).

This means that *demise* – that is, death understood in the normal sense (as the apparently permanent absence of individual experience) – maintains a direct connection to the phenomenon Heidegger calls "death." Heidegger is thus not (pace Haugeland and White) renaming some other phenomenon "death" arbitrarily or merely using this loaded word metaphorically.[11] On the contrary, existential death is drawn from a formal analysis of ordinary demise (or kicking the bucket), and Heidegger thinks that the phenomenon he calls "death" *conditions and structures* our normal way of relating to our own demises. Indeed, because the phenomenon of existential death tacitly *shapes* our normal ways of understanding and so relating to demise, Heidegger suggests that encountering existential death *phenomenologically* can powerfully *transform* our ordinary relation to demise.

To put it simply, *Being and Time* ultimately suggests that the encounter with existential death can help liberate us from a confused and unnecessarily restrictive relation to our own demises, radically freeing up our ways of relating to the fact that our own lives come to an ineluctable end, and so helping us learn to "shed the mortal fear of demise that will otherwise pursue us throughout our lives" (Thomson 2013, 282). I cannot fully reprise that view here, but it turns on recognizing that what our fear of demise is really afraid of is our own not being (or, to put the fear in a way which heightens its apparent paradoxicality, it is an *anxiety* about *being our own not being*), and our own not being is in fact something that we *can* encounter in life, in the "projectless projecting" of existential death. The idea that such an existential encounter with our own not-being can help liberate us from our fear of mortal demise is one of the most important and edifying conclusions of Heidegger's phenomenology of death in *Being and Time*. In what follows, we will seek to better understand the philosophical motivations for that view. Doing so will also help us understand how Heidegger goes beyond this view after *Being and Time*, disclosing from the "nothingness" of existential death an even more liberating and edifying relation to being's apparently inexhaustible phenomenological plenitude for us mortal Dasein.[12] First, however, we need to directly address the question of how the self

---

[11] See Haugeland 2000, White 2005, and, for critiques of their views, see Thomson 2013 and Thomson 2007.

[12] On the crucial phenomenological connection between death and the plenitude of being, see Thomson 2011a (chap. 3), and Thomson and Bodington 2014.

can meaningfully encounter its own *end*, thereby coming to see what such an encounter discloses for Heidegger as his thinking evolves.

2   DEATH AND EXISTENTIAL POSSIBILITY

When *Being and Time* calls death "the possibility of the *im*possibility of existence – that is to say, the utter nothingness of Dasein," it is important to see that the *phenomenon* Heidegger is referring to is not merely our entertaining (conceptually or imagistically) the idea of our own no longer being here – as, for example, when we try to imagine or conceive what the world might be like after we are no longer a part of it. Whether such phantasmatic projections are voluntarily or involuntarily, disturbing or edifying, fleeting or enduring, scientific or fictional, silly or sanctified, the same basic problem remains: any time we imagine a future after our own demise, we *are there* in some sense, if only as the ones doing the imagining, the ones *by whom* that particular fantasy is being played out. (We are the ones conceptualizing or imagining the future from some implicit perspective, reflecting just some particular cares and concerns, and so on.) Insofar as such fantasies about life after our own demise have any content, moreover, they show that we still have an intelligible world while we are imagining them. Such fantasies thus do not constitute true encounters with our own nothingness. For, they do not bring us face to face with "the utter nothingness" of our own "being here" (or *Dasein*) that Heidegger calls *death*.

To understand the phenomenon of death as "the possibility of the *im*possibility of existence," we need to see that Heidegger means "POSSIBILITY" in an *existential* rather than any merely *logical* sense.[13] *Existential* "possibilities" are the embodied life-projects that compose our particular ways of being (such as teacher and student, mother and father, son and daughter, man and woman, tall and short, fat and skinny, graceful and clumsy, brother and sister, skateboarder and bicyclist, friend and colleague, liberal and conservative, poet and revolutionary – and all the myriad other ways of being that Dasein takes up and lives in some particular, embodied way, ways which are usually neither merely arbitrarily constructed nor entirely dictated to us by the objective facts of the case). Such life-projects, taken together, help positively constitute our existences, allowing us to become intelligible to ourselves and to each other in worldly terms. Such existential possibilities are thus not merely the *logically* possible alternatives that can help us understand the structure of some conceptual space. Instead, existential possibilities are the embodied projects that we ordinarily *project* ourselves into (as I like to put it), and so understand ourselves in terms of, as we go about charting the course of our everyday lives. This "charting the course" is usually practical, carried out in that primary mode of Dasein's existence Dreyfus famously calls "skillful COPING," but it can also be cognitive, as when we make explicit plans or formulate conscious ideas about our lives (see Dreyfus 1991, and Thomson 2016b, 54–55).

---

[13] Heidegger does forthrightly acknowledge death's logic, nevertheless, as the implacable logic of *necessity*. *Being and Time* even insists that our relation to death is always one of "certainty" (as mentioned earlier), because he views our ordinary *denial* about our own death (our denial about our own *demise*, more precisely) as a motivated flight from, and so an inauthentic testament to, the *certainty* we nevertheless maintain concerning our own deaths. It is ultimately existential death that our widespread repression of demise is seeking to escape – futilely, until after we come to understand the existential structures that condition our relation to demise. (On the relation of Heidegger's view here to those of Freud and Derrida, see Thomson 1999. That early essay of mine unfortunately follows Derrida in conflating death with demise, thereby generating some confusions.) On how best to disentangle death from demise, and so how to distinguish death's definitive "certainty" from the "certainty" of demise (the formal structure from which it is drawn), see Thomson 2013.

As Heidegger will thus provocatively assert (inverting Aristotle): "higher than actuality stands *possibility*" (SZ 38). There would seem to be at least two reasons for *Being and Time*'s existential privileging of possibility over actuality.[14] First, existential possibilities are *more actual than actuality itself* (so to speak) in that they are what actually *actualize* whatever "actuality" our individual existences possess at any given moment. Metaphorically, existential possibilities are the "clothing" of the world (as Kierkegaard – or rather his pseudonymous clothing, "Anti-Climacus" – put it in *The Sickness Unto Death*, the book that most deeply influenced Heidegger's understanding of death in *Being and Time*). In other words, existential possibilities are the roles, embodied self-understandings, and life-projects that allow an existence to recognize itself as some*thing* – and so not just as a sheer, naked existing, devoid of worldly content and so fully transparent to itself. Indeed, Heidegger's search for such a fully transparent self-understanding is what initially motivates his turn toward death in *Being and Time*, as he seeks an understanding of Dasein that is primordial and so, he thinks (problematically, in my view), complete (Thomson 2013). Such "naked," sheer *existing* turns out to be our most original condition, although this primordial core of the self is something that we can only *re*discover after existential death strips us of the clothing of the world.

Remember that *Being and Time* seeks to help recognize and remedy one of the most basic and pervasive errors of modern philosophy by showing us that human EXISTENCE is not really a physical *thing*, and so is not best understood as a thinking *substance* (as with Descartes' *res cogitans*). At a more primordial level of existence (which the understanding of the self as a *res* or spatially extended "substance" presupposes but cannot account for), *existence* is simply a "standing-out" (*ek-sistere*) into temporally structured intelligibility. At the most basic level, this inexorable core of the self – namely, existence as sheer *existing* – is primordially "uncanny" (*unheimlich*), literally "not-at-home" in the world (SZ 189).[15] (Existence is thus "in but not of" the world, according to the Christian view Heidegger is creatively *secularizing* here, as scholars have long recognized.)[16]

This lack of fit between self and world, *Being and Time* suggests, is what ultimately motivates our existential anxiety, for the resulting lack of predetermined answers about what it means to be impels each of us to take an individual stand on what it means to be the self that we are, even if only by rushing into thoughtless conformism in order to abjure and repress the need for such resolute decisions (Thomson 2013). More generally, by recognizing the primarily *existential* nature of the self, *Being and Time* seeks to disabuse the philosophical tradition of the "category mistake" (as Ryle rightly called it) of trying to understand Dasein's intelligible world-disclosure in terms drawn from our understanding of physical objects.[17] Instead, we should recognize that "*the 'essence' of Dasein lies in its existence*" (SZ 42), and focus our phenomenological investigations

[14] For a third reason, having to do with Heidegger's neo-Romanticism, see Thomson 2011a, 159.

[15] Heidegger could almost agree with Sting that "we are spirits in the material world," were Heidegger not seeking to deconstruct and transcend such traditional metaphysical dichotomies as the one between "spirit" and "matter" (Thomson 2005, chap. 1).

[16] Authenticity is indeed a secularized "version of conversion," as Cavell (1989) nicely put it. Heidegger's phenomenological appropriation of Kierkegaard allows him to develop and convey his own sense of the significance of the *conversion* experience, i.e., the experience of death and rebirth *in life* (an experience polysemically "crucial" to Christianity). Thus, Heidegger is able to appropriate (and transform) some of the deepest insights preserved in the Christian tradition by expressing them in the secularizing language of existential phenomenology (see also Mulhall 2007).

[17] We make such a category mistake, e.g., whenever we erroneously approach the self as if it were a substance with properties (after Descartes), or otherwise *miscategorize* the self by treating it as if it could be wholly understood in the same categories as physical nature, whether following Kant or those contemporary "naturalists" who advocate eliminative materialism or other forms of *scientism*, i.e., the false belief that natural science has a monopoly on legitimate forms of inquiry (including inquiry into the nature of the self). Phenomenology's famous "anti-

accordingly, seeking to discover and display the distinctive structures that underlie Dasein's world-disclosive "existence" (Heidegger's term of art in *Being and Time* for Dasein's distinctive mode of being).

Existential possibilities "stand higher" than actuality not just because they *actualize* whatever actuality we might possess, but also, second, because these existential possibilities always *transcend* or stretch beyond our current actuality as well. Existential possibilities outstrip whatever actuality we possess, just as my way of being a teacher, a father, or a man all draw on a past that is no longer actual and project into a future that is not yet actual. We also experience our own being (or the intelligibility of our selves) as exceeding what we can actually express in terms of the roles, goals, and life-projects through which we ordinarily understand ourselves, so that we are always more existentially than we are actually. Nevertheless, I live through my existential possibilities by *being* (for example) a teacher, a father, and a man in my own life – which I can only do "authentically" by continuing to *become* a teacher, father, and man (Dreyfus 1991, Thomson 2016a), thereby being what I have been and what I am becoming.

In this way, existential possibilities help render temporality itself intelligible to us, because they work to concretely *constitute* the particular living worlds that make us intelligible to ourselves, shaping and reshaping the living worlds that we *are*. On those occasions when we *reconstitute* our living worlds (transforming central aspects of our embodied self-understandings) by, for example, sloughing off an outdated, arbitrarily restrictive, unsatisfying, or otherwise unfree or no longer liveable way of being a father or man (before taking up a more liberating or otherwise meaningful embodied self-understanding), existential death plays a crucial role in such transformations, as the very moment of that old world's collapse. Indeed, such periodic personal deaths and rebirths to the publicly intelligible world are precisely what Heidegger means by "anticipatory RESOLUTE-NESS" or, in a word, "AUTHENTICITY" (Thomson 2004a). Unlike Heidegger, I do not think this process is always best thought of as a *complete* collapse and transformation of the self, but I do understand what drives him (both philosophically and autobiographically) toward that view. Put simply, Heidegger thinks such a global collapse of our life-projects will follow from the collapse of our *defining* life-project (what *Being and Time* calls our "ultimate FOR-THE-SAKE-OF-WHICH"), as this collapse of what we care most about (or the end of that project we least want to abandon, "what we would give up last," as Dreyfus once memorably put it) sets off a chain reaction that brings all our other life-projects cascading down in its wake.[18]

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger (rather subtly) defines Dasein's *existential possibilities* in terms of our "being-possible" (*Möglichsein*) and our "ABILITY-TO-BE" (*Seinkönnen*), that is (respectively), in terms of our *life-projects* and our *projecting* ourselves into or upon those projects as we go about being (or becoming) what we take ourselves to be, charting the course of our everyday being-here (SZ 145; Thomson 1999). By repeatedly referring to death as "the possibility of an impossibility," then, Heidegger is deliberately designating a stark and desolate phenomenon in which we find ourselves (at least momentarily) unable to project ourselves into any of the existential projects that ordinarily bestow our lives with meaning. This explains why Heidegger also repeatedly refers to

naturalism" (which goes back to Husserl but is extended by Heidegger) is primarily directed against just such reductive and mistaken scientist views (Thomson 2011a, chap. 2).

[18] See Thomson 2013. On the collapse of the project guiding *Being and Time*, the avowedly "metaphysical" project of "fundamental ontology," see Thomson 2015. (I explain some of Heidegger's other autobiographical motivations for this view in Thomson 2009, as these remain directly relevant to phenomenology.)

death as Dasein's "*ownmost* ability-to-be": in the phenomenon of existential death, our selves get stripped of the positive, worldly contents they ordinarily seem to possess (as we lose all the concretions of self conferred on us by the projects we can no longer project ourselves into in our lives). When we undergo this shipwreck of our life-projects in existential death, however, we do not simply disappear entirely; instead, we encounter ourselves as (what I have called) a *projectless projecting*, that is, as a sheer *existing* that (at least temporarily) finds itself unable to exist *as* anyone or anything (teacher, man, father, and so on).

To encounter death as the existential "possibility of an impossibility" is thus (as Heidegger glosses it) to encounter a *positive* "nothingness" – that aforementioned "utter nothingness of Dasein." The nothingness we encounter in existential death is not the onrush of oblivion (although we can also encounter existential death – *in passing*, as it were – in the phenomenon of mortal "demise," if we are aware that our demise is approaching, since if we are conscious when we demise we will die as well, though we can also die without demising, fortunately, since otherwise we would have to write out phenomenologies of death by séance or Ouija board – Thomson 2013). Dasein's "utter nothingness" is instead what Heidegger calls the "solus ipse" or "*self alone*" (SZ 188), that is, the utterly desolate core of the self that survives the shipwreck of all its worldly projects. In this way, existential death discloses to Dasein its "ownmost ability to be," that projectless projecting that forms the very sine qua non of the self in *Being and Time*.[19] The ontological core of the self disclosed in the phenomenon of existential death is not "alone before God" (as Kierkegaard has it). Instead, in existential death, Dasein is alone before the "nothing" in its own sheer existing, standing out into a world of possibilities it cannot connect to, and so starkly encountering itself as "a naked 'that-it-is-and-has-to-be'" (SZ 134; Dreyfus 2005a).

As *Being and Time* shows, I can explicitly experience what my bicycle implicitly *is* when it breaks down, and so just stands there as (for example) a broken piece of equipment that was supposed to get me to school, so that I could get to my class on time, for the sake of being a good teacher, a responsible colleague (and so on). In the same way, Dasein can come face-to-face with itself as an embodied stand on the meaning of existence when its being-in-the-world breaks down in existential death and we find ourselves unable to be anything in particular at all, unable to exist as anyone or anything. This is what Heidegger means when he suggests that, in the attunement of radical anxiety that accompanies such existential death, the naked "self" of sheer "MINENESS" encounters "the 'nothing' – that is, the world as such, the world as world" (SZ 187; Thomson 2013; see also the NOTHING).

3 FROM THE EXISTENTIAL PHENOMENOLOGY OF DEATH TO HEIDEGGER'S LATER ONTOLOGICAL PLURALISM

Rather than precipitously dismissing Heidegger's core idea of the self's encounter with its own nothingness as absurd or hopelessly paradoxical, we have tried to appreciate the deeper phenomenon that Heidegger deliberately risks such paradoxical formulations in order to try to help us see *for ourselves* (or to see, in the terms of phenomenology, *authentically*, in a way that makes it our own). The larger goal of the existential phenomenology of death in *Being and Time*,

---

[19] See also Crowell 2001b.

as we have seen, is to understand "death" in its full ontological significance. However daunting that task remains, anyone seeking to understand Heidegger will eventually need to undertake it. Why? Because, as Haugeland recognized, "death, as Heidegger means it, is not merely relevant but in fact the fulcrum of Heidegger's entire ONTOLOGY" (Haugeland 2000, 44). In other words, we cannot understand the early Heidegger's project of "fundamental ontology" without understanding what *Being and Time* means by death.

Indeed, I think we need to go even further: Heidegger's phenomenology of death helps disclose something like the Ur-phenomenon of his later work, that irreducibly polysemic and multivocal phenomenon which he first calls "the noth-ing of the nothing," an ontological abundance that appears to be both conceptually and practically inexhaustible and so, as such, the ultimate source of whatever authentic and meaningful disclosure remains possible for us mortal beings, now and in the future (see Young 2002; Thomson 2011a, chap. 3). This also means, however, that the phenomenon death discloses (i.e., the "nothing") brings Heidegger face-to-face with the ontologically indigestible iceberg that spells the ruin of his central early project, namely, *Being and Time*'s ill-fated attempt to deliver a "fundamental ontology" (or "understanding of the sense of being in general"). Pace Haugeland, then, I side with those who think Heidegger never delivered on that promised fundamental ontology, not in *Being and Time* nor in any of the works that followed while he continued to pursue his ill-fated "metaphysical" project with a desperation that continued to grow until – in a philosophically profound instance of existential *death* – Heidegger was finally driven to abandon this metaphysical project, subsequently making its very impossibility the central pillar of his later thought (Dahlstrom 2015, Thomson 2015). In other words, Heidegger's phenomenology of death catalysed the philosophically and politically tumultuous "middle" period in his thinking (between 1929 and 1938), inadvertently setting off that philosophically (and politically) motivated transformation in Heidegger's thinking long referred to as his "TURN" (Thomson 2005, Young 2015, Thomson 2017).[20]

To understand how Heidegger's early phenomenology of death fits into the larger development of his thought, then, one needs first to understand what death discloses initially, as we have mostly done here by focusing on his famous phenomenology of death in *Being and Time*. Then, however, one also needs to understand how Heidegger's thinking about this ontological Ur-phenomenon death discloses transforms over time in his thinking. We cannot fully do that here, of course (see Thomson 2011a). But perhaps what remains most difficult and important to understand is the way *Being and Time*'s existential phenomenology of death first discloses the paradoxically positive "nothingness" that will soon become 1929's notorious "noth-ing of the nothing." This active "noth-*ing*" of that which is not-yet-a-thing – and yet nevertheless continues to make itself felt phenomenologically (by subtly beckoning to be disclosed) – *turns* out to have been the first glimmering of "being as such" (in Heidegger's own retrospective self-understanding at least; see the NOTHING). Thus Heidegger's hermeneutic phenomenology of death helps disclose being in its ineliminable DIFFERENCE from any "metaphysical" understanding of "the being of entities," exposing being's seemingly ineliminable phenomenological

---

[20] To understand this changing phenomenon is thus to begin to understand the deep philosophical motivations behind the controversial "turn" that leads from Heidegger's early to his later work, philosophical motivations that remain closely tied up with his political struggles as well. The close and important connections between Heidegger's thinking and his politics have always been visible (Thomson 2005), but have become obvious in light of his most recently published "Black Notebooks" and related work (Thomson 2017).

"excessiveness," by which being escapes every attempt to capture what it means to *be* in some final understanding of "the being of entities" – including *Being and Time*'s self-avowedly *metaphysical* attempt to capture being in a fundamental ontology (Thomson 2015).[21]

What Heidegger's phenomenology of death discloses, then, is a paradoxically positive nothingness – "the noth-ing of the nothing" – that is, the inchoate phenomenological emergence of what is-not-yet but is actively becoming intelligible in time. Existential death thus discloses that subtle but dynamic Ur-phenomenon of being's phenomenologically primordial emergence into intelligibility. What Heidegger's phenomenology of death shows us is not merely the apparent oblivion of mortal demise. In an end that is not yet the end, existential death discloses what *Being and Time* already calls the very "futurity" of the future, its "incessant" coming to be, the temporally dynamic basis of all we can encounter phenomenologically so long as we *are here* (or Dasein), together, critically inheriting each other's projects and transformatively making them our own.[22]

Iain Thomson

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 233–66; GA4:165/190; GA5:217–18/162–63, 263–67/196–99; GA54:143/96, 234/157; GA65:282–86/ 198–201; GA77: 216–17/140–41; GA79:17–18/17

DEBT (*SCHULD*). SEE GUILT.

DECLINE (*VERFALL*). SEE FALLING.

DECONSTRUCTION (*ABBAU*). SEE DESTRUCTION.

DEPLOYMENT (*BEWANDTNIS*). SEE AFFORDANCE.

DEPOSITION (*AUSSAGE*). SEE ASSERTION.

DESIGN (*RIß*). SEE RIFT.

---

[21] On the way death helps disclose "the noth-ing" that turns out to be the first phenomenological glimmering of "being as such" in its difference from the metaphysical notion of "the being of entities," see, e.g., Thomson 2005 (esp. chap. 3); and Thomson 2015, where I seek to explain these important transformations in Heidegger's very way of understanding, and so pursuing, the "question of being." Finally, I discuss the question of whether existential death is Heidegger's way of repressing mortal demise in Thomson 2013.

[22] I presented a version of this paper at the Hubert Dreyfus memorial conference of the American Society for Existential Phenomenology, at Wake Forest University, Winston-Salem, North Carolina, September 23, 2017, where I dedicated it to my greatest teacher (not only of Heidegger, but of teaching itself). For helpful comments and criticisms, I would also like to thank Bill Blattner, Taylor Carman, Eric Kaplan, Stephan Käufer, Simone Mahrenholz, Wayne Martin, John Richardson, B. Scot Rousse, Joseph Schear, Charles Taylor, Mark Wrathall, and Julian Young. I would also like to sincerely thank Mark Wrathall for requesting this piece and patiently awaiting its (long overdue) arrival.

54.
DESTINY (*GESCHICK*)

A DESTINY IS AN underlying tendency in the order of things, a force that provides a sense of direction even though it does not coerce in any way. Though events that happen as a result of destiny often can be given a physical explanation, the idea that some events are more or less *appropriate* to the current scheme of things remains a deep assumption built into the use of the word (the word *Geschick* has "being appropriate" as one of its meanings). The centrality in Heidegger's work of the German word translated as "destiny," *Geschick*, reflects a preoccupation with that notion in the nineteenth century (e.g., "manifest destiny"). The intuitive force of the idea of destiny comes from the sense that events seem to have a meaning-laden trend. This sense obviously provides the emotional punch to the account of destiny in §§72–77 of *Being and Time*. In these sections, we can see how a way of unfolding makes sense in the nexus of a temporal order.

Based on this idea of destiny, Heidegger uses a set of homonymously and etymologically related terms to clarify the "historicity" (*Geschichtlichkeit*) of human existence. Much of the earlier discussion in *Being and Time* aimed at bringing to light how life can be seen as what we might call a "life-story" in which what has come before prepares the way for the outcome of the whole. In chapter 5 of Part II, Heidegger asks if there might be a way of understanding life that is "more primordial" than the ordinary one conceived as TEMPORALITY. His answer is that existence is bounded by two "ends," a pole of what has already come (the "past") and a futural end of what is yet to come (*Zukommen*). Human existence unfolds within these two poles, the future and the past. His claim is that the dimension of futurity is often ignored, even though it provides the unifying bond of our being. Heidegger asks whether there is a more primordial account of our being-a-whole, one that brings to light our wholeness of being. We cannot grasp our being solely by looking at our facing forward with projects and anticipations, leaving "behind it" all that has been (SZ 372). Such an orientation of the analysis remains "one-sided" without embracing DASEIN's "having-been." Therefore, we must include "being toward the beginning" to show how the whole of life "stretches itself along between birth and death" (SZ 373).

The emphasis on human historicity (*Geschichtlichkeit*) makes it possible to see a number of terms as related. The German word *Historie* refers to the topics and methods of the subject-matter called "history"; it recounts a course of events as a "story" (*Geschichte*; see HISTORY). This moreover connects a semantic cluster of words that draw their meaning from the verb *schicken*, an ordinary word for sending or delivering, implying a sending or being sent. Dasein's authentic being is characterized by *Schicksal* or sending.

Given these resonances, Heidegger sees human life as a story-shaped narrative or *Geschichte*, a word now implying dispensation and delivering over. This lets us see our lives as a "happening" or "historizing" (*Geschehen*) which can be stretched along. For each individual Dasein there is a "fate" (*Schicksal*). On this view, sending or dispensation and the binding together of the fates of a community yield a people's "destiny."

> Our fates have already been guided in advance, in our being-with-one-another in the same world and in our resoluteness for definite possibilities. Only in communicating and in struggling [*Kampf*] does the power of destiny become free. (SZ 384)

Individual instances of Dasein grow in RESOLUTENESS as they join with others to carry out the appointed tasks of the PEOPLE (*Volk*).

In the works after *Being and Time*, it is clear that "Dasein" more commonly refers to a group or a nationality than to an individual. Our shared destiny "can be brought into view as the *Geschick* of being by recollectively thinking upon the history of Western thought" (GA10:95/65). So, for example, reflecting on the shared ideal of FREEDOM in the West can enable us to recollect our overarching ideal of freedom for all. Reflecting on modern SCIENCE, with its conception of being as objectness, "reveals itself as objectness for consciousness" (GA10:96/65). The different "epochs" of being (comparable to Kuhnian paradigms) "spring up like sprouts." The epochs can never be derived from one another, much less can they be placed on the track of a partial process. Nevertheless there is a "legacy [lit. "handing down"] from epoch to epoch" (GA10:135/91). Epochs are therefore dispensations of being, not human achievements. We can only be open to new appearances in the unfolding of being itself, regarding it as a "gift" (*Gibt*) of being.

The later works present us with an understanding of "destiny" as an enframing or SYNTHETIC COM-POSIT(ION)ING (*Ge-Stell*; see also INVENTORY) with a past filled with significance moving toward a proper summation (*eschaton*). It is a series of epochs directed toward a meaning that cannot (yet) be fully grasped. In our current frame of reference, everything has to be placed in proper relations to other things. In our epoch and world, everything is posited as a "STANDING RESERVE" (*Bestand*, GA79:64) that rules all else. We say that the epochal meaning of today is "TECHNOLOGY," but this is not because humans have instituted or created technology. On the contrary, in our current paradigm, humans are created and carried along by destiny. Though "BEING" (*Sein*) needs humans to move forward toward the promised epoch to be dispensed in the future, humans can act in this way only if carried along and given direction. Destiny gives shape and order to what there is. It is a con-figuring, one which can change. Since the past determines the present, it can be known only by recollectively thinking: the attempt to remember what sends all reality toward its predefined end. As Heidegger says, to send oneself to oneself (*sich schicken*) "is to be fitting, suitable; it is to reconcile oneself with, . . . to comply with the indicated directive" (GA79:64). This vision of destiny as a moving forward guided by a previously given project explains why Heidegger can say, "As destining, being itself is inherently eschatological" (GA5:327/246).

Charles Guignon

55.
DESTRUCTION (*DESTRUKTION, ZERSTÖRUNG*) AND DECONSTRUCTION (*ABBAU*)

Destruction is the process of hermeneutical and critical dismantling of philosophical concepts, carried out in order to recover the insights that orginally motivated them. Heidegger employs a number of words for "destruction" – including *Destruktion*, *Zerstörung*, and "dismantling," "unbuilding," or "deconstruction" (*Abbau*). Destruction is invoked programmatically in *Being and Time* §6, "the Task of Destroying the History of Ontology" (SZ 19), but is not widely discussed in the text, since it was to feature in the unpublished Part ii of *Being and Time* (SZ 39). Interestingly, the term *Destruktion* does not occur explicitly in his 1925 *History of the Concept of Time*, the *Prolegomena* lectures (GA20), the first draft of *Being and Time*, but the term *Abbau* is used once (GA20:118) to express how phenomenology really aims at disclosure and at the methodological "dismantling of concealments" (GA20:118). Similarly he speaks about the need to offer a "critical reflection" (*kritische Besinnung*, GA20:184) on phenomenology's basic assumptions about consciousness and intentionality, and the need to rethink the character of Dasein. The "greatness of phenomenology" consists in being able to revive and perform a "repetition" (*Wiederholung*) of the original questioning of Plato and Aristotle (GA20:184). In 1925, then, Heidegger conceived of "destruction" as part of a critical dismantling of traditional concepts to order to gain a clearer view of phenomena. In particular, the original questioning of the Greeks concerning being has to be reawoken and repeated in a way that is creative and questioning. In 1924, he says that the "domination of Greek metaphysics" needs to be subjected to radical deconstructive critique (GA64:102).

Because Dasein is essentially historical, and in a certain sense, even "is" its past (SZ 20), Dasein is so immersed in its tradition that its understanding of the current situation is obscured. In order to free Dasein up in relation to its tradition (and in particular the tradition of Western metaphysics), a procedure known as "destruction" is required. It is therefore necessary to "destroy" the metaphysical assumptions encrusted on philosophical concepts in order to clarify the primordial or originary experiences (*ursprüngliche Erfahrungen*, SZ 22) from which the concepts spring and which have been covered up in the later tradition. Heidegger aims to "*destroy* the traditional content of ancient ontology" (SZ 22) to uncover "primordial experiences" and display the "birth certificates" of concepts (e.g., what *logos, phusis, ousia*, or *alêtheia* originally meant for the ancient Greek philosophers). Heidegger always insists that the procedure of "destruction" is not to be construed negatively, rather it is a critique with "positive tendencies" (*positive Tendenz*, SZ 23), a "positive appropriation of tradition" (GA24:31). Furthermore, destruction is not meant as a purely antiquarian inquiry into the past, rather it aims at the present: "the phenomenological destruction of ontology and logic is a critique of the present, not a critique of Greek ontology" (GA64:103).

The concept of "destruction" (*Destruktion*; but also with less regularity, *Abbau* and even, more rarely, *Zerstörung*) appears regularly in Heidegger's early Freiburg lecture courses (1919–23), where the activity of removing the metaphysical edifice encrusted on religious experience is referred to as "destruction" (*Destruktion*, also *Zerstörung*, GA60:311). Heidegger encountered the term *destructio* (one of the few terms of Latin origin he employs with positive signification) in the writings of Martin Luther, who uses the term for the attempt to preserve the integrity and purity of vision needed for salvation against the smugness and self-certainty of the "carnal" view in medieval neo-Aristotelian scholasticism.

Heidegger invokes "destruction" already in his Winter semester (1919/20) *Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, where he lists the levels of phenomenological understanding ("destruction," "pure understanding," "interpretation," and "reconstruction," GA58:139). In this course he refers to the "critical destructions of objectifications" (GA58:255) needed to clarify phenomenological intuition. In the 1920 course, *Phenomenology of Intuition and Expression*, he speaks of "phenomenological *Destruktion*" (GA59:35) and "phenomenological-critical destruction" (GA59:29–30), understood not so much as "demolition" (*Zertrümmern*), but rather as "de-structuring" or "dismantling" (*Abbau*, GA59:35). In *Introduction to Phenomenological Research*, philosophy involves "destruction in the ontological investigation of existence" (GA17:110), understood as a becoming-free from the grip of traditional "handed-down" ontological concepts through a "dismantling" leading back to the "basic sense" (GA17:113). In his 1920/21 lectures, *Phenomenology of Religious Life*, he says modern history of religion needs a "phenomenological destruction" to allow the evidence of its "fore-conception" to manifest itself (GA60:78). In his 1922 review of Karl Jaspers's *Psychology of Worldviews* (first published in *Wegmarken*, GA9) Heidegger criticizes Jaspers for not being radical enough in his concepts and says a destruction of what has been handed over involves "explicating the original motivational situations in which the fundamental experiences of philosophy have arisen" (GA9:3–4/3). Furthermore, he writes that "this kind of destruction always remains inseparable from concrete, fully historical, anxious concern for one's own self" (GA9:34/30). The 1923 lecture course *Ontology – The Hermeneutics of Facticity* (GA63) also has a discussion of *Destruktion*.

In his lectures in the 1920s, Heidegger usually presents "destruction" as an integral part of the hermeneutical-phenomenological method; its function is to break through the inevitable covering up of phenomena and to reawaken the original motivational sources that underlie the concepts. In his 1922 draft study on Aristotle (the so called "Natorp Report") he states "*hermeneutics carries out its task only on the path of destruction . . .*" .

In *Being and Time* Heidegger constantly emphasizes the need for a "violent" way of approaching the phenomena, i.e., through the "destruction of the HISTORY of ontology" (SZ §6). In particular the concept of Dasein demands deconstruction, beginning with the "I am" (*sum*) in Descartes' *cogito ergo sum*. Similarly the assumed concept of TIME in Western metaphysics. Heidegger himself regularly refers to the need to carry out a destruction of the concept of "substance" (GA9:329/251).

The term "deconstruction" (*Abbau*) does not occur at all in *Being and Time*. However, it is invoked significantly in the 1927 lecture course *Basic Problems of Phenomenology* (GA24), where it is contrasted with "construction" (*Aufbau*). Husserl was using the term *Abbau* in the middle twenties to refer to a process of getting behind experiences in the natural attitude to reveal what the natural attitude covers up. The term *Aufbau* is also found in one of Husserl's own students, David Katz's *Der Aufbau der Tastwelt* (Katz 1925). In *Basic Problems of Phenomenology* §5 (GA24)

Heidegger says there are three "basic components" of the phenomenological method – *reduction*, *construction*, *destruction* – which are mutually related (GA24:31). He interprets "reduction" as leading back (referencing Husserl) specifically from entities to their being (GA24:29/21). Phenomenological ontology also needs a free projection or "construction." But, since existence is historical, one must find a way to bring into view the "average concept of being" that has guided investigations – and this requires "destruction" or "deconstruction" (*Abbau*). All philosophical concepts – including the most radical ones – are "pervaded by traditional concepts" and therefore there is a need for a "critical process in which the traditional concepts ... are deconstructed down to the sources from which they are drawn" (GA24:31/32).

After *Being and Time*, the term appears only rarely. The term "destruction" does not appear in the main text of *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* (1929), for instance, although the whole book may in fact be said to be part of Heidegger's "destruction of the history of philosophy" (Heidegger's notes in the fourth edition refer to this, GA3:xiii). In his 1947 "Letter on 'Humanism'" Heidegger complains about people who misunderstand the concept of "destruction" in *Being and Time* as something negative (driven by the logic that the opposite of the positive must be negative), as for instance in the interrogation of *logos*, *ratio*, and *logic* as an attempt to degrade reason (GA9:330/264). In his 1955 lecture "On the Question of Being" (*Zur Seinsfrage*) Heidegger clarifies that the term "destruction" (*Destruktion*) "has no other intent than to reattain the originary experiences of being [*die ursprünglichen Seinserfahrungen*] belonging to metaphysics by deconstructing [*Abbau*] representations that have become commonplace and empty" (GA9:447/315). In the lecture "Time and Being" (1962) Heidegger explains the relation between destruction and deconstruction:

> Only a dismantling [*Abbau*] of these obscuring covers – this is what is meant by "dismantling" – procures for thinking a preliminary insight into what then reveals itself as the destiny of being. Because one everywhere represents the destiny of being only as history and represents the latter as a happening, they attempt in vain to interpret such happening in terms of what is stated in *Being and Time* about the historicality of Dasein (not of being). By contrast, the only possible way to anticipate the latter thought on the destiny of being from the perspective of *Being and Time* is to think through what was presented in *Being and Time* about the dismantling of the ontological doctrine of the being of entities. (GA14:13/OTB 9)

In his Zähringen seminar of 1973, Heidegger resituates the process of destruction within the deeper problematic of thinking the "history of being" and criticizes the "naiveté" of the "ontological destruction" in SZ (*Viere Seminare*, GA15:395/FS 177–78). In later works, Heidegger seeks to make "destruction" into a central part of his inquiry into being.

Destruction, then, aims at overcoming the natural tendency of everyday Dasein to let things slide into "averageness" and indifference. Dasein's everyday way of living its past means that it can "fall prey" (*verfallen*) to tradition, which takes on the character of self-evidence and thereby inhibits access to the original "sources" (*Quellen*, SZ 21) motivating the tradition's insights. Tradition "deracinates" (*entwurzelt*) the very historicality of Dasein in favor of presenting it as just the way things always have been. Destruction, then, involves liberation from tradition and from the commonsense understanding of concepts. The past has to be subsumed into a project, made to respond to the questions posed from the present. Heidegger (in SZ §76) speaks of the need for authentic "REPETITION" (*Wiederholung*), taking up what it deems essential from the

past and making the past authentic, in a sense embracing its own "birth," removing from its existence its hollow "ANYONE" character (SZ 391). One aim of destruction is to uproot and decenter the everyday "fallen" public discourse of a particular time and to give back to Dasein its possibility of living life authentically in a resolute manner.

Heidegger's notion of "destruction" continues to have significant influence. In particular, the French philosopher Jacques Derrida offered the translation "deconstruction" which has become canonical. Derrida writes that he wanted a term in French to translate *Destruktion* or *Abbau* that did not have the negative connotations of annihilation or demolition. The term "deconstruction" had the grammatical and engineering connotations that seemed most suitable.

Dermot Moran

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 39, 89, 392; GA3:xiii; GA9:3–4/3, 34/29, 118/30, 163/125–26, 330/264, 347–48/264; GA20:184; GA24:29, 31, 32; GA58:139, 255; GA59:29, 30, 35; GA60:78, 311; GA64:102, 103

FURTHER READING

Bernasconi 1990, Bernasconi 1994, Crowe 2006, Dastur 1990, Derrida 1985, Ijsseling 1986, McNeill 2012, Moran 1994, Ruin 2012, Soffer 1996, van Buren 1994

DETERIORATE (*VERFALLEN*). SEE FALLING.

DEVASTATION OF BEING (*SEINSVERLASSENHEIT*). SEE ABANDONMENT OF BEING.

56.
DIFFERENCE (*UNTERSCHEIDUNG*)

D IFFERENCE IS A condition of being separate and dissimilar, on the basis of which we are capable of drawing distinctions. We typically distinguish between entities within the same or approximately the same domain (e.g., black and white, house and garden), between entities in different domains (e.g., God and the number five), and between different domains of entities (e.g., chemical and psychological agents). Not to be confused with any of these differences, though underlying all of them, is the most essential difference: the difference between entities and being. This difference is essential because it is based upon a differentiating that is the basic feature of BEYNG (*Grundzug des Seyns*) or, equivalently, the event (*Ereignis*; see ADAPTATION) in which being and entities come into their own in relation to one another. Far from being a product of our capacity to distinguish between what is and what is not the case, this differentiation of being and entities is the basis of that distinction. Philosophers, not least metaphysicians, have traditionally presupposed this difference but failed to ask how it is possible (GA14:87n.; GA70:68; GA71:121, 126).

In the 1920s and early 1930s Heidegger characterizes this difference in ontological and transcendental terms, dubbing it "the ontological difference." What concerns us – BEING-IN-THE-WORLD as we are – is this or that innerworldly entity. Whether the concerns are theoretical or practical, they require that we transcend such entities by understanding them, however inchoately, as being. The "ground of the ontological difference" is this *transcendence*, i.e., the way that DASEIN is always already caught upon in a distinctive movement beyond entities, not to just another entity, but to the WORLD within which they have their being.

As the unity of Dasein's temporal horizons, the world is the realm of possibilities that it presses toward, returns to, and abides among (constituting the future, past, and present, respectively). In other words, it is the unity of the horizons that Dasein stands out toward in an ecstatic-horizonal process that makes up the basic character of TIME. So construed, the world is fundamental to the sense of being at all, the TEMPORALITY that ultimately co-constitutes at once Dasein's interactions with entities and their disclosure of their respective being to it (GA9:123/97, 134f./105f.; GA24:322; GA27:223; GA29/30:521).

As Heidegger stresses in 1929/30, the ontological difference is sui generis and universal. Even when it is difficult in a particular case to determine the differences obtaining between entities in the same or different domains, the starting point for doing so (i.e., the entities themselves) is given. By contrast, since being is no particular entity, we are initially at a loss when it comes to ascertaining the very field or dimension of the difference between being and entities. Yet whenever we assert what something is, that it is, or how it is (*Wassein*, *Daßsein*, *Sosein*), we utilize the difference, albeit typically without heeding it and "without being able to ascertain that we are thereby applying some sort of knowledge, a rule, a proposition and the like" (GA29/30:518). However indifferently being may be understood, it is always understood in terms of some implicit division, at the very least in terms of the traditional difference between *essentia* and *existentia* (corresponding to the questions "What is it?" and "Is it?" respectively). Given being's

incomparability with anything on the plane of entities, the distinction is not one that is presented as something that we can know and become acquainted with as an object. Strictly speaking, Heidegger submits, *we do not make or draw* (*voll-ziehen*) this distinction at all, since it is instead something that "happens *with us* as the basic happening of our being-here" and, indeed, not occasionally but from the ground up since "entities – wherever and however we go towards them – stand *already in the light of being*" (GA29/30:519). The way that this distinction happens, basic to being-here, coincides with the projection of a world, i.e., with what is inherent to being-here: world-formation.

In the 1929/30 lectures, Heidegger uses two terms for "difference," sometimes interchangeably (a practice from which he later departs): the Germanic *Unterschied* and the Latinate *Differenz*.

> The ontological difference [*ontologische Differenz*] is . . . the difference [*Unterschied*] . . . in which being is distinguished from entities, the being that determines the latter at the same time in the constitution of its being . . .. The ontological difference [*Differenz*] is the difference carrying the ontological in general . . ., thus not a specific difference [*Unterschied*] that can and must be made within the ontological sphere. (GA29/30:521)

In addition to calling attention to an important limitation of ontology, this last remark presumably applies to Heidegger's own steps toward a fundamental ontology in *Being and Time* where he distinguishes being-here (*Da-sein*) from being-handy (AVAILABLE: *Zuhanden-sein*) and from being-on-hand (OCCURRENT: *Vorhanden-sein*). So, too, in what might be dubbed an "ontic-ontological" distinction within *Being and Time*, he distinguishes the hammer from its being-handy to the carpenter or the plant from its being-on-hand to the botanist. These specific intra-ontological differences (*Unterschiede*) are one thing, the ontological difference (*Differenz*) quite another.

By the mid-1930s Heidegger begins to question the very idea of an ontological difference and its transcendental trappings. Ontology has traditionally taken its conception of being from entities (theology's primary being and ontology's universal set of entities); transcendental philosophy anchors conditions of the possibility of being at all in a particular entity, i.e., a transcendental subject. In the medieval epoch, being was equated with creation (a relation between entities, i.e., creator and created); in modernity, with being an object (projected by or placed before a subject). In such cases, the fundamental question of the SENSE of being is not raised at all, as the only sort of difference seriously countenanced is that between entities (creator/created, object/subject). This failure to conceive the difference is the legacy of metaphysics that presupposes but overlooks the difference, as it focuses single-mindedly on entities. (Heidegger regards the history of metaphysics as a history of disempowering being by according unlimited primacy to entities; GA65:427f., 449; see HISTORY OF BEING). Perhaps precisely because it is metaphysics' presupposition and starting point, thinkers were at a loss as to how to deal with it (GA70:69). In any case, metaphysics' traditional obliviousness to the ontological difference signals, in Heidegger's eyes, its failure to question what it means to be, a question that is a sine qua non for differentiating it from entities and elaborating the unity of being and entities (GA65:250, 424).

Yet, precisely because of its traditional shortcomings, the ontological difference remains "unavoidable," in Heidegger's eyes, as a means to the truth of the difference between being and

entities. He proposes discarding the ontological difference, but only by way of understanding its origin in the hidden difference between beyng and entities, the essence of which is adaptation or the appropriating event (GA14:46/OTB 37; GA65:272, 250, 423, 426, 465ff.). Clarifying the ontological difference sets the stage for "leaping over" this differentiation and thinking its origin and unity (GA65:207, 251, 451, 469). Herein lies Heidegger's reason for introducing the antiquated *beyng* (*Seyn*). He characterizes it sometimes in ways that are equivalent to the appropriating event (i.e., adaptation), other times to history, to stress that the difference is beyng's differentiation that gives rise to the ontological difference between being and entities.

> *Without having experienced the truth of being as adaptation, we shall not be able to know the difference and, thereby, the differentiation.* As long as we do not have that experience, we find it strange that "being" itself differentiates itself; since being is for us an empty concept and itself a product of differentiating, but the latter . . . as our doing. (GA71:129; see, too, GA65:465; GA70:69)

Ever the phenomenologist, Heidegger insists that the first step to thinking the difference non-ontologically is the recognition that it is not the product, but the ground of thinking. So, too, far from being something that can be overcome and explained by something further, this difference or, better, the differentiating is what is most proper to beyng itself. In other words, beyng's differentiating is the very beginning, albeit precisely by way of being kept apart and secluded in the event of the CLEARING in which entities become entities. The expression "kept apart and secluded" (a translation of *Abgeschiedenheit*) indicates beyng's difference from entities. "Differentiation" names, not an activity of thinking, but the essential unfolding of beyng (*Wesung des Seyns*), an unfolding "into the uniqueness of its departure" (*in die Einzigkeit seines Abschiedes*), in adaptation or the appropriating event of the difference (GA70:70–74).

   If someone enters my field of vision, she can only do so because something else has departed it, giving way to her. If I had x-ray vision or divine intuition, nothing would take leave of my purview. Playing on this metaphor, Heidegger characterizes the difference between being and entities in terms of being's departure (*Unterschied als Abschied*, GA70:25; GA71:126). Its departure coincides with the clearing in which entities are present, coming into view. Since Plato, metaphysicians have understood entities' being in terms of this presence that enables their viewability. At the same time, metaphysicians typically or, better, epochally reduce it to the standing, ahistorical presence of a paradigmatic sort of entity (e.g., *deus sive natura*) (GA14:41, 46/OTB 33, 37; GA65:477f.). This traditional FORGETFULNESS OF BEING is an obliviousness to its difference from entities. Being cannot be assimilated to entities; even if we understand being simply as presence, that presence is never identical to what is present. Just as appearing does not, strictly speaking, appear, so the presence of a being is not itself present. This absence is the departure of being; it is not our doing at all.

> Being differentiates itself from entities. Being is the differentiating and *is* the difference. And we ourselves, far from first making the difference, instead follow it and this following first gives us understanding at all. (GA71:128; see, too, GA11:59/ ID 50; GA70:76)

In 1957 Heidegger states that his thinking is centered on difference *as* difference. We only think being in a way that matters (*sachlich*) when we think it in its difference from entities and vice versa. Metaphysics moves within the un-thought difference between being and entities,

conceiving what is so differentiated in ontological and theological terms, but without thinking the difference itself (or thinking being as the difference). Heidegger accordingly proposes taking a step back from metaphysics to consider the difference itself (and metaphysics' obliviousness to this difference essential to it). This difference cannot be something that we place before ourselves or represent (*vorstellen*) since any such attempt leads to construing difference as a relation that we produce. Construing the difference as such a relation amounts to reducing it to a distinction (*Distinktion*) produced by our understanding. The difference is instead something that we find in advance of placing anything before ourselves or representing it (GA11:56, 58ff., 68ff./ID 47, 49ff., 61ff.). What we find is that being "comes over" entities, unconcealing (*entbergend*) them but by no means in such a way that they could be approached in any manner before this event. Instead, entities only come on the scene, "arriving" as something unhidden (*Unverborgenes*), when being "comes over" them. This arrival, securing themselves in unhiddenness, is what it means "to be an entity" (*Seiendes sein*). The way that being "comes over" entities and the way that entities thereby "arrive" coincide; it is not as if there is being without entities or vice versa. Moreover, being in this context is not a universal; "there is being" only in this or that historical character. "Being (in the sense of coming-over [entities] by unconcealing [them]) and entities as such (in the sense of the self-securing arrival) essentially unfold as what is so differentiated from the same, the dif-ference [*Unter-schied*]" (GA11:71/ID 65; see, too, the entirety of GA73.2, containing twenty years of expansive musing on the ontological difference (*Differenz*) – not least as an errant path (*Holzweg*) – in contrast to the dif-ference (*Unter-schied*) in beyng as beyng).

Daniel O. Dahlstrom

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA51:21–65; GA70:68–83; GA71:121–33; GA73.2

FURTHER READING

Dahlstrom 2017

DIFFERENTIATION (*UNTERSCHEIDUNG*). SEE DIFFERENCE.

DISCERN (*ERKENNEN*). SEE COGNITION.

57.
DISCLOSEDNESS (*ERSCHLOSSENHEIT*)

Disclosedness signifies both how the world opens itself to human beings, and the essential feature of human existence itself, namely opening up the world.

The morphology of the verb *erschließen*, "to open up" or "to disclose," betrays a basic ambiguity: the root verb, *schließen*, means "to shut, close, lock," whereas the prefix *er-* here connotes "opening up."[1] In *Being and Time*, Heidegger restricts the usage of the verb and its substantive form, *Erschloßenheit*, to "opening up" (*aufschließen*) and "open[ed]-ness" (*Aufgeschlossenheit*), respectively (SZ 75). Hence, as "opening up," *Erschließen* names what Dasein (as existing) *does*; by the same token, as "(being-) opened up," *Erschlossenheit* essentially qualifies the world as it is "brought before" Dasein (cf. SZ 181). As Heidegger writes: "the entity that is essentially constituted through being-in-the-world *is*, in each case, itself its 'there' ['*da*']" (SZ 132); and again: "Dasein is its disclosedness" (SZ 133). In other words, for Dasein to exist or "be there [*da*]" just is for it "to-be-disclosing" its world to itself.

The difficulty in grasping Heidegger's notions of disclosing and disclosedness lies in the fact that they seem to join, in a single notion, "disclosure," what we normally think of as two distinct ideas: self and world. In purposely undermining this distinction, Heidegger attempts to find a common, primordial zone in which subject and object have not yet been separated (cf. GA9:138/108). Thus, Dasein and "its" world are not ontologically distinct entities. Rather, they are distinct aspects of one phenomenon – the lighting-up of a world-for-me – which, at the same time, *is* "me," i.e., the zone of my awareness, coping, and consciousness, in short, ("my") Dasein. Hence, to say the "world" is disclosed to or by Dasein, should not be taken to mean (as it easily could) that there exists a "mind-independent world" on one side, with a "world-independent subject [*Dasein*]" on the other, as if the world could subsist without being disclosed, or Dasein could exist without disclosing (cf. esp. SZ §43). No: what it means to be a world is simply *to-be-disclosed*; disclosure is *world-ing*.[2] And since what "does" the disclosing is Dasein, to which, in turn, the world is disclosed, it is clear that "world" and Dasein are on Heidegger's account mutually constitutive correlates. They are "equiprimordially disclosed" (SZ 137).

Disclosure is "ontological" in two senses. First, it is the "essence" (*Wesen*) of Dasein; second, it is the condition of the possibility of particular things appearing at all. Thus if we liken the disclosure of "world" to the lighting up of a stage,[3] then the manifestation of entities is the appearance of players and props in that lit zone. The former manifestation is ontological; but the latter is ontic, and hence is not called "disclosure" but "discovery" (*Entdeckung*; *Entdecken*; cf. esp. SZ 85, 210).[4]

---

[1] Cf. Eichinger et al. 1982, 95; Kühnhold and Wellmann 1973a, esp. 149 (case 8) and 344 (3.5.1.2), and cf. 291 (chart 1). See also Elsen 2011, 216.

[2] "World never '*is*'; rather, world '*worlds*' [*weltet*]" (GA9:164/126).

[3] "[The] world never '*is*' [i.e., is not "ontic"]" (GA9:164/126). Cf. esp. SZ 210, 87, 148.

[4] Dreyfus (1991, 102–07) compares disclosing and discovering.

In German, a common meaning of *erschließen* is: "to open up so as to enable exploitation." Thus, exploratory drilling "opens up" or taps a natural resource like oil; a foreign market may be "opened up" for trade; a bus route "opens up" or makes accessible a mountain valley. In these cases, the oil is not yet being exploited; trading is not yet taking place; no tourists are actually riding into the valley. Thus, in Heidegger's case, too, "disclosure" indicates a manifesting-as-possible rather than actual appearing, i.e., a *dynamis* rather than an *energeia*, in Aristotle's sense.[5] *What* appears as possible in this way is not any particular thing, but rather the opening or CLEARING (*Lichtung*) in which particular things may appear, the stage that is Dasein's world.

What does it mean to say that Dasein "*is* disclosing"? First, that *Dasein* is not a "thing" – neither AVAILABLE (*zuhanden*) nor OCCURRENT (*vorhanden*) – but rather a primordial open*ing*-up of a zone in which the available and the occurrent appear in the first place. This zone is the "there" (*da*), being which just is Dasein. As Heidegger writes: "The term, '*da*,' means this essential disclosedness [*wesenhafte Erschlossenheit*]" (SZ 132); and conversely: "disclosedness . . . is the basic form of Dasein, in accordance with which it *is* [i.e., lives out] its '*da*'" (SZ 220).

Insofar as disclosure is how Dasein exists – i.e., its existing consists in disclosing – we must interpret disclosure by clarifying the existentiales active in that disclosure. In other words, the world does not disclose itself of itself, but is disclosed thanks to the constitutive structures of Dasein, the so-called existentiales, which are always at work constituting-the-world.[6] In particular, DISPOSEDNESS and UNDERSTANDING[7] "characterize, as existentiales, the original disclosedness of being-in-the-world" (SZ 148; cf. 160, 220); both make especially evident the "dynamic" features of disclosedness, viz., its universality and potentiality.

First, disposedness is the way Dasein "finds itself," in short, its "mood." Because it is in and through my mood that the world-and-I are simultaneously disclosed to me, disposedness holds the "primary" position with respect to disclosure (SZ 138); it is the disclosure of Dasein's *existence tout court* (SZ 162). The mood in which my world and I "find" ourselves is not an intentional state singling out a particular object. Rather, it "tunes" (*stimmt*) the disclosed world as such, like the color, brightness, and tone of the light in which the whole[8] stage is lit and in which the spectator, too, is absorbed. Yet just because Dasein is absorbed in the mood of its *da*, this mood not only discloses, but simultaneously *closes-off* (*verschließt*) *Dasein* from itself (SZ 136), in just the way that a spectator (or player) becomes lost in the action on stage. Yet it is only out of the "disclosing orientation to the world" of disposedness, that inner-worldly entities are able in the first place to encounter (*begegnen*) Dasein (SZ 137–38).

Now, even as I may lose myself in my MOOD, even this "moodiness" that always accompanies my being-in-the-world always involves a degree of a second existentiale that Heidegger calls understanding: disposedness always already understands, "if only in the sense that it suppresses [that understanding]" (SZ 142). That is, I always am aware, when I am aware of how I find myself (i.e., of my disposedness), of the populated world *in* which I find myself, even if no particular entity is the explicit target of my attention. In other words, my mood is not nonsensical, it does not put me in a state of unconsciousness or complete unawareness – rather,

---

[5] Cf. esp. SZ 85: "das wir als entdecktes Seiendes nicht 'sein' lassen, wie es ist, sondern bearbeiten, verbessern, zerschlagen."

[6] For Heidegger, Dasein, in its basic CONSTITUTION (*Grundverfassung*) of being-in-the-world, reveals itself at the same time and in terms of disclosedness, "with respect to world, to being-in, and to the self" (SZ 200).

[7] Discourse is equiprimordial with understanding and disposedness, and is "constitutive for [Dasein's] existence" (SZ 161).

[8] SZ 137, 146.

it is as if I lose myself in the *mere* mood embracing my world and me, allowing all particulars to blur into an indistinct background, but never losing touch with the fact of this indistinct background that I tacitly "understand" as "my office," "the park," or "my living room."

The second existentiale crucial for grasping disclosure is understanding, by which Heidegger designates the inexplicit awareness of our situation and environment, in short, the disclosed world. As disposedness discloses the mood or lighting of the Dasein's "there," understanding reveals the infrastructure of that world, the "stage" of life on which the action plays out. This environing situation is always "understood" *as a whole*, and is the preliminary "there" or opening that "frees up" (*gibt frei*) the arena (SZ 86–87) for inner-worldly entities to encounter us explicitly as particulars (cf. SZ 134, 144, 152). The world is disclosed to Dasein through understanding, because understanding reveals the world as an arena of significance. Thanks to its intelligible structure, the world *is* for Dasein in the first place. More precisely, the world is for Dasein *as* intelligible but not "thematically"; it appears articulable,[9] but not yet as articulated in one way or another (SZ 83). The world "makes SENSE" (cf. esp. SZ 151 87) to us in an everyday way, and so is "familiar" (*vertraut*) and "trusted";[10] but just *as* familiar, neither it, nor any particular object or zone within it is explicitly known (*erkannt*, SZ 134).[11]

Understanding discloses the intelligibility of the world (discloses the intelligible world) as a network (*nexus*) of significance (*Bedeutsamkeit*, SZ 87). In general, these disclosed networks (*nexūs*) are equipmental, e.g., a kitchen, desk, workbench, or automobile-cabin. The entities in such environments do not stand out in particular (or as particulars), but holistically as teleological *nexūs* (*Bewandtnisganzheiten*)[12] or systems of utility (SZ 83) convenient for *Dasein*'s various projects (SZ 147). The refrigerator-counter-drawer-stove-pan-skillet-sink-sponge-towel-chopping-board-knife-fork-spatula-cork-screw-etc. *nexūs* (nested in other background *nexūs*) is understood, as *Dasein* stands cooking, *implicitly* as its "work-space," the "kitchen" as a whole. The kitchen-nexus is intelligible because each of these things within the "kitchen-world" is tacitly understood as teleologically referring (*verweisend*) to others: the knife to the cutting-board, the skillet to the stove, the towel to the sink, etc.; and all of these available things have handles or grips that refer to the hand, the "tool of tools."[13] *Nothing* useless encounters *Dasein* in this space – except as "trash," and even this "refers" to the waste can under the sink. When *Dasein* enters the kitchen, the kitchen space is disclosed to it as such, as it tacitly, implicitly understands all of these interrelations all at once and as a whole (SZ 74–75; cf. 143, 146), viz., as having the capacity (*dynamis*) for being engaged with so as to prepare a meal (cf. SZ 76).

The workspace discloses a work-world, but not *as* a world. That is, while Dasein takes care of the work at hand, it is not explicitly conscious of the world as such. For example, as it actualizes the potential of the skillet, the spatula, the burner-valves, each of these entities is "opened up [*aufgeschlossen*]" in its being, and "discovered," i.e., brought out from or highlighted against the background kitchen space. Yet it is only thanks to the disclosure of the background nexus of utensils that this work and the particular utensils in use can "encounter" (*begegnen*) Dasein at all (SZ 85, 220);[14] they are freed up by the disclosed background. Hence disclosedness or

---

9 Circumspection discloses, i.e., "the already-understood world is laid-out ["interpreted"; *ausgelegt*]" (SZ 148), viz., via the *as*-structure (SZ 149).

10 Cf. Plato, *Republic*: the intentional state in which the soul encounters the everyday world in the cave is *pistis*, "trust, faith, assurance."

11 Cf. Macquarrie and Robinson, BT, 105–06, n. 1.   12 Cf. esp. SZ 210.   13 Aristotle, *De Anima* II, 431a1–2.

14 Cf. Aristotle, *Physics* I, 184a21ff.

disclosure is "ontological" (SZ 143, 151) in the sense that it makes possible the explicit "discovery" (*Entdeckung*) of ontic particulars that are "lit up" or stand out from that background (cf. SZ 220–21).

Although Heidegger singles out disposedness and understanding as elemental to disclosure, yet he also says that a third existentiale, DISCOURSE (*Rede*), is co-constitutive of disclosure (SZ 220, 162). By "discourse," Heidegger does not mean the actual uttering of words or phrases, but more generally the capacity to articulate the ontic boundaries of "sense" (*Sinn*) that under-standing all along tacitly traced in Dasein's world (SZ 161). Discourse is the means by which that articulated disclosure of world "has its say" (*kommt zu Wort*), specifically in its "about-ness" (*Worüber*, SZ 161). That is, in "being-about . . .," discourse highlights and makes explicit the implicit teleologically determined links among particular entities. Audible (or legible) speech actualizes,[15] communicates, and discloses these links to others, but they must already exist potentially in the "wholeness of the aforementioned structures" disclosed in the attuned and understood environing world (SZ 163).

As mentioned at the outset, dis-closure (*Er-schließen*) displays a tension between "closing" (*schließen*) and "opening-up" (*er-*), a tension Heidegger exploits so as to highlight the interplay of universality and potentiality. For example, "SPACE" may be disclosed phenomenologically in its universal "spatiality." But then "spatiality" conceals a more determinate sense of "space," e.g., as a constellation of particular places (like a house) or as a mathematical manifold or "metrical order" (SZ 110). Conversely, as we saw above, the wholeness of the world (its "universality"), while always operative in Dasein's sense of familiarity with its world, is occluded by the particular entities with which Dasein is continually occupied in daily life.

Similarly, Heidegger writes that in "falling" (*Verfallen*), "the authenticity of being-self [*Selbstsein*] is closed off [*verschlossen*] and marginalized, but this closed-ness [*Verschlossenheit*] is but the *privation* of a disclosedness [*Erschlossenheit*], which phenomenally manifests itself in the fact that the flight of *Dasein* is the flight *from* itself" (SZ 184). If Heidegger here presents closedness as the privation of disclosedness, this seems to contradict his earlier identification of disclosure and unlocking (*Aufschliessen*). For the conception of disclosure as an "unlocking" presupposes that the world is *ab initio* closed off, and that while disclosure is a "freeing-up" (*Freigabe*, SZ 83, 85), the world does not give itself freely. Rather, the "disclosing of Dasein is always carried out as a doing-away with occlusions and obscurities, as a shattering of the pretenses by which Dasein locks itself out from [or locks itself up against] itself" (SZ 129). The paradox may be resolved as follows: insofar as Dasein is "there," and "there" just means the ontological opening in which things appear to and encounter us, disclosure is the primitive and irreducible essence of Dasein. Nevertheless, because it is *also* Dasein's tendency to "fall," the lighted openness of disclosure continually tends to darken and close up again (SZ 221f.). Therefore, Dasein's existence consists in a constant struggle to maintain its essential openness: it *is* disclosedness, but this requires that it constantly strive *to* disclose.

Finally, Heidegger's vision of disclosure's constant striving to "wrest away" (SZ 222) the light from the darkness reappears in his conception of truth as *alêtheia* or "unconcealment" (SZ 219). As discussed above, discourse articulates the tacit ontic distinctions in the understood world; in uttered statements, the speaker "discovers" (*ent-deckt*) particular entities in that world (SZ 218). Now the traditional conception of truth as correspondence between statements and things (i.e.,

---

[15] Cf. e.g., Aristotle, *De Anima* II, 417a25ff.

facts or states of affairs in the world) "locates" truth in just such statements (SZ 214ff.). To the degree that these are but surface actualizations of the deeper existential potency called discourse, their "truth" is also parasitic on discourse's antecedent disclosure of the world. It is only in and as a result of the (ontological) disclosure of world that the (ontic) discovery of things and statements about things (both true and false) is possible (SZ 218–19; cf. esp. SZ 148). Indeed, "truth" in Heidegger's phenomenological sense turns out to be nothing other than the originary, holistic disclosure of Dasein's "there" (SZ 220–21; cf. esp. Tugendhat 1970, 328ff.).

Alan Kim

58.
DISCOURSE (*REDE*)

Discourse is "the articulation of intelligibility" or "the 'significant' structuring of the intelligibility of being-in-the-world" (SZ 161).[1] Like disposedness and understanding, Heidegger understands discourse as an existential, as an element that ineluctably characterizes Dasein as the human form of life. The reflections about discourse belong in the context of questions asked within a philosophy of language in the broadest sense because, for Heidegger, discourse is the "existential" and concomitantly "ontological" foundation of language. The phenomena of language and linguistic meaning are to be grounded in a non- and extra-linguistic practice that precedes them. According to Heidegger, linguistic meaning depends upon our practical dealings with things in the world and our social relations, by means of which those meaningful structures and referential connections through which we come to an understanding of the world are generated. This understanding is articulated in and through discourse.

Heidegger's analysis of equipment (SZ 66–89) constitutes an important background to his reflections about discourse. The hammer means something (refers to something) for the one who takes it into their hands in order to beat a nail into the wall, and the one who uses a hammer has understood that for which a hammer serves, even when they do not or cannot express this linguistically. For Heidegger, the hammer functions as an example of equipment which, because of our dealings with it, refers to something else. Equipment never exists in the singular, instead belonging to an equipmental whole and forming a network of referential and functional relations that is intimately bound up with our dealings and our form of life. In addition to the term "reference," Heidegger also uses the expression "signifying." He speaks of signifying in relation to individual references, while the term "significance" (SZ 87) is applied to referential wholes. Since the singular is always already embedded within referential relations, since the singular is what it is only in the context of a whole and only here attains its meaning, significance in the sense of a relation precedes signifying in the sense of the involved character of particular references. Signifying can only – if one follows Heidegger's line of thought – exist against the background of significance. The concept of significance refers to a framework that functions as a requirement and a precondition of signifying in the sense of (practical) reference, as well as of signifying in the sense of linguistic meaning. Heidegger remarks: "this significance itself however, with which Dasein is always already familiar, harbours within it the ontological condition of the possibility that Dasein, which understands, can, as that which interprets, disclose something like 'significations,' which in turn found the possibility of the being of word and language" (SZ 87). Discourse is the space in which the implicit and inexpressible understanding that already manifests itself in practical dealings with the world and in relationships with others can be explicitly appropriated and made accessible through articulation.

---

[1] All translations of *Sein und Zeit* here are by Marilyn Stendera.

A philosophical reconstruction of Heidegger's reflections about the relationship between language and discourse, as well as of the foundational claim that is decisive in this context, faces the difficulty of clarifying whether discourse precedes language, or if connections to language are not after all already embedded within it. Once one looks away from the specific use that Heidegger makes of the distinction between language and discourse, it is easy to interpret the difference between language and discourse in roughly the sense of Humboldt's differentiation between language as *ergon* and *energeia*, or de Saussure's distinction between *langue* and *parole*. However, in distinguishing between "language" and "discourse," Heidegger is not thinking of the difference between language as a self-enclosed system of rules and differential relations between various signs within a linguistic system, and individual uses of language or language as the product of the performances of individual speakers. His aim is, after all, to ground a founding relation which accords with the content of the thesis formulated in the analysis of equipment – the thesis about the priority of non-linguistic significance over linguistic signifying.

Heidegger's conception of the relation between language and discourse can be initially distinguished if one recalls his understanding of the role of the ASSERTION within language. A central feature of Heidegger's founding project is that it conceives of assertions and propositionally structured judgments as secondary and derivative modes of language, which cannot be granted a privileged position with respect to our understanding of the world. Assertions are much rather deemed to be something that is founded in a more primordial relation to the world.

> Assertion is not a free-floating behavior that could out of itself disclose entities as they are primarily, but rather always already maintains itself on the basis of being-in-the-world.... It requires the fore-having of something disclosed in general, to which it points in the manner of determining.... The primordial carrying out of interpretation consists, not in a theoretical assertoric sentence, but rather in the circumspectively concerned putting aside or changing of unsuitable tools "without wasting a word." The lack of words should not lead to the conclusion that there is a lack of interpretation. (SZ 157)

Heidegger here advocates for a view of things that can be understood as "pragmatic" in the broadest sense: that is, practical engagement with the world is primary, as opposed to those theoretical descriptions thereof that are constructed with the help of assertions. And not only this. The assertion as a specific theoretical form of referring to the world is not only embedded in performances of practice that precede it, but is in the end only possible on the basis of such practice; and the world is already disclosed – that is, structured and organized – without propositionally structured sentences having necessarily been in play in this context. Assertions are not only grounded, however, in pre-linguistic practices such as our instrumental dealings with the world; they are – as Heidegger asserts – founded in discourse, which already has a structuring function: "discourse is existentially equiprimordial with disposedness and understanding. Discourse is the articulation of intelligibility. It therefore already underlies assertion and interpretation" (SZ 161).

Heidegger's arguments occasionally give the impression that discourse is to be understood as something that has a linguistic structure in the broadest sense without being assertoric. He claims more explicitly, however, that discourse is to be established before language. Heidegger's conception of discourse oscillates between a broadly linguistic (pre-predicative and non-assertoric) and a pre- or non-linguistic pragmatic understanding thereof. The difficulties for an appropriate explication of this concept stem above all else from Heidegger's understanding of

the term "discourse" as a translation of the Greek concept of "λόγος" (cf. SZ 165; GA20:364–65). He understands this concept in the sense of a GATHERING or collection which did not originally have a relation to language:

> but λόγος did not originally mean discourse, speaking. The meaning of the word has no immediate relation to language. Λέγω, λέγειν, *legere* in Latin, is the same word as our "selecting" [*lesen*]: selecting heads of corn [*Ähren lesen*], selecting wood [*Holz lesen*], the selection of grapes [*die Weinlese*], the special selection [*die Auslese*]. . . . This means: to put one with the other, to bring them together into a unity, in short: collecting; during this, one will at the same time be lifted up in contrast to the other. (GA40:132/131)

This comment brings out more clearly that discourse as a form of human life is pre-predicatively connected to the significance of the world, although the cited passage explicitly points out that a language need not be presupposed for this. In the end, however, Heidegger's texts in the context of *Being and Time* lend themselves just as much to a lingual as to a pragmatic reading. One could dissolve this tension by asserting that, for speaking beings, language always plays a role as the background for interpretation, without every interpretation thereby having to be carried out linguistically. For a speaking creature, the opening of a door is embedded within a multitude of convictions and desires (one believes that one will thereby enter into a house, hopes that one's space for living will be nice, and so forth), without the understanding that articulates itself in the opening of the door being articulated linguistically. The implications that this talk of a linguistic background has for non-linguistic interpretation are certainly open to further philosophical exploration. If interpretation can only proceed from such a background, then positing that language depends ontologically upon discourse leads to inconsistencies. Whether these can be resolved would need to be examined more precisely in the course of philosophical investigations. Returning to Heidegger's text offers no help, since its claims cannot be unequivocally reconstructed.

The structuring function that Heidegger ascribes to discourse is crucial: "discourse is the 'significant' articulation of the intelligibility of being-in-the-world, to which being-with belongs and which always maintains itself in a particular determination of concerned being-with-one-another" (SZ 161). Heidegger enumerates the essential structural moments of discourse as (1) what the discourse is about, (2) the said as such, (3) the communication, and (4) the announcement. According to him, these four moments always belong together, which is why it is erroneous to see pure assertion – which is dominated by the aspects named under (1) and (2) – as a privileged way of accessing language. Heidegger is especially opposed to grasping language by means that are oriented exclusively toward the propositional content of assertions, and instead emphasizes the dialogical and expressive components of language and of speaking. The orientation toward the assertoric sentence is, for Heidegger, a sin into which Western philosophy of language has fallen, one that has frequently led to looking at language from the perspective of LOGIC. By founding language in the existential of discourse, however, Heidegger hopes to be able to tackle the "task of liberating grammar from logic" (SZ 165). Such liberation is required because the meaning of linguistic expressions cannot be adequately described if one orients oneself according to the pattern or model of the OCCURRENT and understands language or the meaning of linguistic expressions as something object-like. This is particularly likely in the case of assertions and has, according to Heidegger, recurred time and again in the tradition of reasoning within the philosophy of language. These reflections are only taken up again in §68, which deals with the "temporality of discourse." In opposition to an "occurrent model" of

language and its meaning – a term one could use as a short description of the view that Heidegger criticizes – he asserts the TEMPORALITY of discourse (and thus presumably also the temporality of linguistic meaning): "discourse is in itself temporal, insofar as all discoursing about . . ., of . . ., and to . . ., are founded in the ecstatic unity of temporality. . . . Only through the temporality of discourse, that is, of Dasein overall, can the 'origin' of 'significance' be illuminated and the possibility of concept-formation be made ontologically intelligible" (SZ 349). At this point, the question about the relation between BEING and TIME becomes the question of the relation between meaning and time. Heidegger posits close connections between the temporality of Dasein and the temporality of discourse or the temporality of meaning.

"Language itself is the house of being. Within its shelter abides the human being" (GA9:313/239) – thus wrote Heidegger in his 1946 "Letter on 'Humanism.'" His later works above all are dominated by issues pertaining to philosophy of language in the broadest sense, particularly concerning the question of whether, and to what extent, the human experience of the world is determined by its linguistic possibilities, and whether what Heidegger called world disclosure is primarily a linguistic phenomenon. At first glance it seems as if the position that asserts itself in these works represents a disjuncture from the reflections of *Being and Time*. More recent research about Heidegger's philosophy of language shows clearly, however, that the approach of *Being and Time* contains a series of reflections which can be connected to the reflections about the philosophy of language found in the later works.

Christoph Demmerling

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 160–70, 349–50; GA20:361–76; GA40:131–43/130–43

FURTHER READING

Carman 2003, 204–63, Dreyfus 1991, 215–24, Adrián Escudero 2013, Hirsch 1978, Höfner 2008, 227ff., 255ff., Wrathall 2011, 95–155.

DISMANTLING (*ABBAU*). SEE DESTRUCTION.

DISPENSATION (*FUG*). SEE FITTINGNESS (*FUG*).

59.
DISPERSION (*ZERSTREUUNG*)

D ISPERSION IS A condition that befalls DASEIN, in which it loses a coherent focus as it is drawn or attracted to the many and various possibilities of EVERYDAYNESS.
In *Being and Time*, the German term for "dispersion" – *Zerstreuung* – is also translated as "distraction" and is used to describe Dasein's everyday, inauthentic way of being in the "ANY-ONE." Dasein's inauthentic everyday self is absorbed in and distracted by the world around it.

Dispersion is first introduced at the end of chapter 4 of *Being and Time* in order to characterize the everyday kind of being of the anyone-self. Heidegger argues that "As an anyone-self, the particular Dasein has been *dispersed* into the 'anyone,' and must first find itself" (SZ 129). As we are told at the outset of *Being and Time*, Dasein can "'choose' itself and win itself; it can also lose itself and never win itself; or only 'seem' to do so" (SZ 42). As dispersed into the anyone, Dasein has not yet chosen itself. Rather than taking hold of itself in its own way, Dasein allows the anyone to dictate its way of being. The anyone is no one in particular, it is constituted by a multiplicity of norms, possibilities, and average ways of being, which do not necessarily hang together as a coherent whole. Accordingly, as an inauthentic anyone-self, Dasein's way of being mirrors this structure of multiple and dispersed possibilities. Imagine someone in a clothes shop picking up a leather jacket, trying it on, and then discarding it in favor of a delicate floral dress, then discarding the dress and picking up a tailored tweed suit, and so on and so on. The dispersed self of everyday Dasein is characterized by its inconstancy and lack of commitment to a singular identity.

The idea of the flighty, inconstant dispersion of inauthentic everyday Dasein is brought out more strongly in Division II of *Being and Time*, where it is contrasted with the steady, constant self of authentic RESOLUTENESS (see AUTHENTICITY). In Division II the dispersed self of inauthentic everyday Dasein is presented as having "*los[t] itself in such a manner that it must, as it were, only subsequently pull itself together out of its dispersal, and think up for itself a unity in which that 'together' is embraced*" (SZ 390). This does not mean that Dasein cannot pair the floral dress with the leather jacket, as it were. Rather, it suggests that in more authentic modes of being Dasein must try and unite the disparate elements of itself in a more unified manner. Rather than rejecting one possibility in favor of another, Dasein must attempt to pull all the disparate threads of its life together.

The concrete way in which this dispersed, everyday way of being manifests itself is in terms of distraction – the second way in which *Zerstreuung* is translated. This analysis is elaborated in Heidegger's discussion of CURIOSITY. Curiosity "does not seek the leisure of tarrying observantly, but rather seeks restlessness and the excitement of continual novelty and changing encounters. In not tarrying, curiosity is concerned with the constant possibility of *distraction*" (SZ 172). Curiosity is a familiar aspect of modern life. When one sits down to write a philosophy paper it is easy to get distracted by checking one's emails, looking at social media, browsing online newspapers, phoning a friend, . . . the list goes on. But distraction can also characterize our way of being more generally. Distraction is Dasein's constant concern with "novelty" and

"new possibilities" (SZ 172). Those who are obsessed with the newest trend or the latest fad can thus also be said to be distracted. This constant concern with novelty in turn reflects Dasein's absorption in "things." Accordingly, dispersion and distraction are not only said to characterize specific instances of Dasein's everyday way of BEING-IN-THE-WORLD, but are taken to be determinative of Dasein's "concernful absorption in the world" more generally (SZ 129).

The characterization of Dasein's concern with entities and everyday possibilities as itself a form of distraction, feeds into Heidegger's analysis of FALLING and fleeing. Rather than concerning itself with the question of its own being, Dasein flees from this issue by distracting itself with entities and possibilities that are close at hand. In so doing, Dasein disperses itself into the anyone, falling away from its ownmost authentic potentiality for being itself, and instead perpetuating its existence as an inauthentic anyone-self. Dasein's everyday dispersion and distraction is thus understood not simply as something Dasein falls into, but as a way of being Dasein itself helps to perpetuate. Heidegger argues that Dasein "tactically" presents itself with distractions and "seek[s] new ways in which its dispersion in its affairs may be further dispersed" (SZ 371).

Heidegger's characterization of distraction and dispersion as bound up with falling away from one's own "proper" unified self, references a wider philosophical and theological tradition that has its roots in Augustine (see Dahlstrom 2013b, 50). However, Heidegger can be read not only as endorsing this historical analysis of dispersion, but also as going beyond it. In his essay "Geschlecht," Derrida (2001) argues that for Heidegger *Zerstreuung* is not simply something to be overcome. Rather, it should also be understood as an essential element of Dasein's being.

In Heidegger's ontology, Derrida claims, dispersion is not only the clarification of an inauthentic way of being, but is "marked *twice*, as a general structure of Dasein and as a mode of inauthenticity" (Derrida 2001, 71). *Zerstreuung* as a general structure of Dasein's being is said to be an "originary dispersion" (*ibid.*, 65), which grounds Dasein's ability to concern itself with a multiplicity of objects (*ibid.*, 65–66), explains its particular spatial and historical way of being-in-the-world (*ibid.*, 66), as well as being reflected in the structure and use of LANGUAGE (*ibid.*, 66). Turning our attention to the way dispersion manifests itself in these more "productive" ways, Derrida suggests, can give us a richer picture of how we understand ourselves and our way of being-in-the-world.[1]

Although dispersion is central to understanding inauthentic everydayness – if not Dasein's way of being as a whole – references to dispersion in *Being and Time* are few and far between. Much like the social world and the everyday way of being to which this term pertains, further analysis of *Zerstreuung* is absent from Heidegger's later work.

Charlotte Knowles

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 129, 172, 338, 347, 371, 389–90

DISPOSE (*FUGEN*). SEE FITTINGNESS (*FUG*).

---

[1] In "Geschlecht" Derrida's particular concern is with sexual difference and how thinking the originary dispersion of Dasein may enable us to overcome our binary conception of sexuality.

60.
DISPOSEDNESS (*BEFINDLICHKEIT*)

Dᴵꜱᴘᴏꜱᴇᴅɴᴇꜱꜱ ɪꜱ ᴛʜᴇ formal title for the dimension of *affectivity* within the ontic concretions of Dᴀꜱᴇɪɴ (i.e., human existence). It is a constitutive moment in the dynamic of the ᴅɪꜱᴄʟᴏꜱᴇᴅɴᴇꜱꜱ of being, and it exemplifies Heidegger's unique approach in the *Being and Time* phase with regard to the simultaneity of an ontological and a quasi-anthropological understanding. Accordingly, we can draw from it both a directive for understanding the ontological condition of any manifestation of being whatsoever, particularly given its profound entanglement with ᴛᴇᴍᴘᴏʀᴀʟɪᴛʏ, *and* a more specific directive for coming to terms with affectivity as a foundational factor in ʙᴇɪɴɢ-ɪɴ-ᴛʜᴇ-ᴡᴏʀʟᴅ. This latter aspect of the notion's significance explains why disposedness is one of those concepts that have given rise to productive elaboration in relative independence of Heidegger's own endeavor. More or less regardless of what Heidegger was himself driving at in the *Being and Time* phase, one might take his account of ᴍᴏᴏᴅꜱ – the prime ontic concretion of disposedness – as the kernel of a productive philosophical perspective on emotion and affect (see Elpidorou and Freeman 2015, Ratcliffe 2008, Ratcliffe 2013, Withy 2015c, Slaby 2015, for attempts to this end).

Heidegger introduces disposedness in Division 1 of *Being and Time* (§§29 and 30) as part of an analysis of being-in-the-world as one of the three equiprimordial modes of being-in (*In-sein als solches*). Given this, it is not off the mark to gloss it as a "ground floor" dimension of ɪɴᴛᴇɴᴛɪᴏɴᴀʟɪᴛʏ, even though Heidegger abandoned the term intentionality for systematic reasons. Disposedness is the passive-receptive dimension of Dasein's "openness to the world" (SZ 137) – inextricable from and on the same footing as its active (*Verstehen*) and discursive (*Rede*) dimensions. As such, affectivity prepares and enables the concrete *directedness toward . . .* characteristic of intentionality as usually understood (and retained in a transformed guise in Heidegger's earlier works): "*The mood has already disclosed, in every case, Being-in-the-world as a whole, and makes it possible first of all to direct oneself toward something*" (SZ 137 – italics in original). As a constitutive dimension of being-in, disposedness is equiprimordial with its other constitutive modes, ᴜɴᴅᴇʀꜱᴛᴀɴᴅɪɴɢ and ᴅɪꜱᴄᴏᴜʀꜱᴇ: "every understanding has its mood. Every attunement is one in which one understands. . . . The understanding which has its mood . . . articulates itself with relation to its intelligibility in discourse" (SZ 335). This has to be kept in mind especially given the tendency in much scholarly work to pry apart and deal separately with presumed affective, cognitive, and agentive dimensions of human comportment.

Moreover, like everything else in the ontological make-up of Dasein, these interlocking modes of being-in are constitutively prone to ꜰᴀʟʟɪɴɢ (*Verfallen*), so that disposedness's ontic concretions – mundane instances of moods or other affective states – will for the most part unfold in their inauthentic forms (cf. SZ 335). When it comes to the modes of *disclosure* proper to disposedness, it will by and large be an "evasive turning away" (SZ 136), i.e., everyday affectivity discloses exactly by *not* revealing a content lucidly, but by way of distractions, by giving rise to shallow diversions, by keeping Dasein from seeing and grasping what goes on with

it in its situated existence. Most notably is this the case with the basic moods ANXIETY and BOREDOM – more of which below.

These characteristics already indicate that Dasein is never *not* in the mode of disposedness – it is constantly attuned to its surroundings in certain ways and thus specifically disposed; what happens in this dimension of its being is always only a change of one mode of affectedness or disposedness into another, never a change from a state that is without mood to one that is with mood or vice versa (cf. SZ 134). Heidegger emphasizes the ubiquity and depth of moods also when discussing the nature of a "fundamental mood" (*Grundstimmung*) of Dasein, in his lecture course *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics* (cf. GA29/30:§17):

> attunements are *not side-effects*, but are something which in advance determine our being with one another. It seems as though an attunement is in each case already there, so to speak, like an atmosphere in which we first immerse ourselves in each case and which then attunes us through and through. It does not merely seem so, it is so; and, faced with this fact, we must dismiss the psychology of feelings, experiences and consciousness. It is a matter of *seeing* and *saying* what is happening here. (GA29/30:100)

This is quite a mouthful, so we will have to consider carefully whether Heidegger's understanding of affectivity as both a foundational dimension of existence and an alternative to all sorts of psychological or mentalistic approaches can live up to its billing.

An intuitive first route to a workable understanding of disposedness begins by taking its hints from the term's verbal meaning in the German original. Heidegger adopted the German word for disposedness – *Befindlichkeit* – as a term of art, by way of a nominalization of the verb *sich befinden*. This can mean – in a somewhat old-fashioned usage – "feeling a certain way" with a close association to "faring so and so" (and this is no doubt what Heidegger draws on when he chooses this term to denote the overall dimension of affectivity). But the dominant literal meaning of *sich befinden* is first of all, and quite simply: *being somewhere* – being located or situated, as in, for instance, "Ich befinde mich in Paris" ("I am in Paris"). Thus, when one takes this as the core meaning, one might just render *Befindlichkeit* as "situatedness": finding oneself *right here*, at this particular place, in these concrete circumstances. However, there is also another, less common dimension of the term's colloquial meaning, namely "to decide, determine, deem as," as in "für gut befinden" ("to deem something good), which can be used to refer to explicit acts of evaluative judgment but also denote a more tacit mode of "finding something so and so" (used in this key, *befinden* has a slightly snobbish ring to it, just as "deem as" sounds a little more snobbish than "find so and so" in English). All these semantic and connotational dimensions play into the philosophical concept of *Befindlichkeit* as Heidegger envisioned it.

Given all this, it is not at all off the mark – although quite odd-sounding in English – to translate *Befindlichkeit* as *findingness* or even *so-findingness* (as John Haugeland once suggested; see Haugeland 2013, 196, and Haugeland 2000, 54). Even more crude English renditions become understandable, as for instance Hubert Dreyfus's "where we're at ness" (Dreyfus 1991, 168). For those who prefer it plain, "situatedness" works well enough as a first take, albeit yielding little specificity. A somewhat ill-advised attempt to find a literal turn of phrase in English that covers a similar segment of real-life cases was "state of mind," as suggested by Macquarrie and Robinson in their 1962 translation of *Being and Time*. But an invocation of "mind," even as part of a standing phrase like this, sits uneasily with Heidegger's

anti-mentalism, particularly given the fact that his anti-mentalism is quite prominent exactly in his discussion of *Befindlichkeit*. A much better gloss is "disposedness" (Blattner 2006) – a term that captures much of the complexity of *Befindlichkeit* as an attitudinal complex combining experiential openness (or closed-off-ness), evaluative orientation, and action-readiness. One should note that "disposedness" is true to the Aristotelian roots of Heidegger's concept of *Befindlichkeit* – in his lecture course *The Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy*, Heidegger glosses Aristotle's *diathesis* – usually understood as "disposition" – as *Befindlichkeit* (see GA18:122). The conceptual lineage ignited by Aristotle's term reaches all the way to Foucault's concept of a *dispositif of power* – an arrangement of heterogeneous elements coalescing into an operative formation at a certain place and time (see, e.g., Foucault 1995).

"Attunement," as suggested by Joan Stambaugh in her 1996 translation of *Being and Time*, is also a decent gloss, as it captures some of the literal meaning of the German term *Stimmung* (mood) in its contemporary usage. Although "attunement" enjoys a wide acceptance among scholars, this term is geared more closely to *Befindlichkeit*'s ontic concretions – moods and other specific affective comportments – and less to the formal ontological dimension of the concept. Attunement surely has phenomenological plausibility, as it evokes a spectrum of possible ways of being in tune (or out of tune) with one's surroundings (a dimension well-captured in the German term for mood: *Stimmung*; see Wellbery 2003 for an excellent history of the concept). In light of this tableau of terminological options, I decline to opt for one favored English term and recommend a context-sensitive conceptual practice instead. *Affectivity* might be used to refer to the general dimension, *attunement* is good in talking about specific manifestations of moods or mood-like affective states, *disposedness* is excellent for getting at the conceptual range of *Befindlichkeit* and at its temporal logic (and this translation will be used as the default option), and *findingness*, while understandably shunned by language purists, drives home the sense of *radical situatedness* that Heidegger wishes to invoke with his choice of term (cf. Slaby 2017b).

In the remainder of this entry, I will do two things. First, I will continue to discuss the main textual passages on disposedness in Division I of *Being and Time*. This is in order to present an informed take on three interlocking "roles" that Heidegger predominantly assigns to disposedness (some of this has already surfaced above). Second, I will relate this standard interpretation to what is – presumably – most crucial about it in Heidegger's own perspective: the relationship of disposedness to time and temporality, which gets elaborated only in Division II of *Being and Time*, in passages much less discussed by Heidegger-inspired philosophers of emotion. As we will see, the best way to understand – and productively continue with – a Heideggerian approach to affectivity is to take affectivity's temporal character more fully into one's stride (see Slaby 2015).

Against the background of Dasein's constantly being-attuned, three closely related core characteristics of disposedness come into view. First, and most importantly from an ontological perspective, disposedness in the sense of "findingness" discloses Dasein's FACTICITY or "THROWNNESS" – the inevitability of its factual being, the brute "that it is and has to be" (cf. SZ 134). Most conspicuously in "negative" moods, findingness is the becoming-manifest of the *burdensome* facticity of one's own being, i.e., that one has no choice but to *be* here and now as this particular entity (with these and that characteristics etc.) in this particular (i.e., specifically constrained and limited) space of possibilities. "Thrownness" refers to Dasein's concrete situatedness insofar as it is tied up with and determines its "having to be" (cf. Withy 2014). This again shows why "findingness" is the appropriate ontological notion for the existential

dimension of mood and emotion: moods pertain to the various ways in which Dasein *finds* "itself" – i.e., "comes to itself" as situated amidst, and itself part of, factical circumstances with which it has to put up in one way or another; one might speak of "ways of finding oneself in the world" (cf. Ratcliffe 2013). One can make a case for "disposition" or "disposedness" here as well, but not without reinterpreting these terms in the more directly spatial sense in which Aristotle's *diathesis* is to be understood.

Importantly, the way in which findingness discloses facticity is not explicit awareness, but rather – at least for the most part – a peculiar "turning-away" (*Abkehr*). Saddled by a gloomy mood, a dash of sadness for example, Dasein will most probably not openly acknowledge its brute and enigmatic facticity (the *naked "there"* of its being), but instead tend to evade this potential existential insight by laboriously turning away from it and onto some entity or other in the world. There are at least two noteworthy examples in Heidegger's oeuvre for how this pervasive "turning-away" unfolds, and they both hint at the fundamental role of findingness for the being of Dasein, i.e., they are used by Heidegger as illustrations of how ontic moods reflect ontological findingness and thus reveal the outline of the fundamental mode of being of Dasein. The first is the seminal exposition of anxiety in *Being and Time* (§40); the second is the in-depth phenomenology of boredom in *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics* (1929/30).

To anxiety Heidegger grants a crucial methodological role in the analytic of Dasein (in this, he is taking important hints from Kierkegaard). Anxiety is a mode of disposedness understood as attunement in which the ontological structure of EXISTENCE (CARE) is brought out in a clear manner. However, and crucially, in everyday life anxiety unfolds such that its very structure is for the most part evaded. It is part of anxiety's everyday guise that Dasein constantly flees from it so that the insight into Dasein's predicament that is offered by anxiety is *not* confronted head-on. The same goes for boredom. Although ultimately disclosing the meaninglessness and ungroundedness of (either a certain span or even all of) one's momentary existence, boredom does not bring this to explicit recognition. Instead, nascent boredom will bring us for the most part to laboriously struggle to distract ourselves, busy ourselves somehow so as to not face up to the existential insight original to this mood (cf. Slaby 2010). To be sure, when bored, Dasein *is* confronted, deep down, with what is going on, but it won't let itself be brought to acknowledge this affective "message" in a direct manner.

This is what Heidegger means when he says moods disclose, for the most part, in the mode of evasion or "turning away." This makes it clear that the way disposedness discloses facticity is a form of "having manifest" radically different from – and deeper than – any kind of reflective self-awareness. The brute facticity of Dasein's existential predicament is somehow "there" in mood, but not as a cognitive or perceptual presence but as the "enigma of naked being" lurking underneath all superficial distractions:

> even if Dasein is "assured" in its belief about its "whither," or if, in a spirit of rational enlightenment, it supposes itself to know about its "whence," all this counts for nothing as against the phenomenal fact of the case: for the mood brings Dasein before the "that-it-is" of its "there," which, as such, stares it in the face with the inexorability of an enigma. (SZ 136)

Like a silent scream of horror in the depths of our being, the awareness of facticity is what we usually do not make clear to ourselves. But it is still "there" at all times, just usually drowned under a layer of laboriousness, talkativeness, or some kind of distracting mental activity. Still,

the enigmatic facticity that is us stands ready to burst forth at any moment. Only in few and outstanding instances of our affective lives – authentic anxiety and profound boredom among them – the enigma of our being is lit up lucidly as what it is. Only then will Dasein come face-to-face with the "naked there" of its facticity, which thereby gets revealed – in the last instance – as radical ungroundedness, as the utter contingency of existence.

The second fundamental characteristic of disposedness in the sense of findingness was mentioned above already: Findingness has always already disclosed being-in-the-world *as a whole*. And only on the basis of this initial holistic disclosure is any directedness toward something specific at all possible. In virtue of this holistic character of its way of disclosure, findingness is the backdrop to all specific modes of directedness, in the manner of a simultaneous disclosure of world, one's own being, and one's BEING-WITH others (cf. SZ 137; see Ratcliffe 2013 for elaboration). A key emphasis here is on "*as a whole*" – i.e., not this or that entity or aspect of the world is revealed as being such and such in findingness, but the world and Dasein's being-in it as a whole gets specifically disclosed (this is reminiscent of Wittgenstein's remark: "The world of the happy man is a different one from that of the unhappy man," *Tractatus*, 6.43). One can see here that this second point is basically already implied in the first characteristic, i.e., that findingness discloses facticity. Consider anxiety again: how might the facticity of *our being* be disclosed other than by lighting up the *entire structure* of our current dwelling in the world? What is also evident from this is the way that self-disclosure and world-disclosure are inextricable in findingness. Self and world are "there" only in constitutive mutuality (cf. Slaby and Stephan 2008). Outside of artificial and belated cognitive maneuvers, there is no self-disclosure without world-disclosure and no world-disclosure that is not equally self-disclosure (self-disclosure here meant in the non-cognitive way just hinted at). Crucially, the peculiar way that the "self" figures in disclosure is provided for by affectivity. This is because *being affected* amounts to this: a non-reflective mode of self-involvement, a *being-brought-back* to oneself (see, e.g., SZ §68). In this more precise, holistic, and *self*-involving manner, affectivity is pervasive in Dasein's disclosedness.

The third fundamental characteristic of Heideggerian disposedness – disposedness as affectivity – directly continues the second point. The way the world is encountered in our everyday practical dealings (*Besorgen*) is crucially determined by affectivity:

> existentially, affectivity (*Befindlichkeit*) implies a disclosive submission to the world, out of which we encounter something that matters to us. Indeed from the ontological point of view we must as a general principle leave the primary discovery of the world to "bare mood," (SZ 137–38)

The encountering of entities amidst one's projects and dealings unfolds in the form of "being affected by …, " i.e., we are bothered by the unhandy, stricken with fear by the dangerous, angered by the offensive, elated by the good, or contented by what works seamlessly (and so on). These various modes of being-affected by aspects of the current situation are enabled by a broad range of prior attunements or "affectabilities" (*Angänglichkeit*), such as fearfulness, irritability, shamefulness, and so on. Thus, Heidegger construes affectivity broadly as an interplay of general background attunements (i.e., ground-level modes of world-disclosure) with more focused, situational foreground affects (roughly, specifically directed intentional affective comportments). A basic enabling structure consists of various modes of affectability on the basis of which concrete affects – specific ways of being-affected-by – take shape in line with current

circumstance. This is the way in which Heidegger construes how disposedness constitutes Dasein's fundamental openness to the world, namely that it is articulated in a range of distinct *dimensions of affectability* in terms of which entities are encountered in everyday life. This marks the way in which the world is always already disclosed in general ways – namely, in terms of dimensions of *possibility*: as that which *has the potential* to scare, to please, to anger, to elate, to bore, or embarrass us (cf. Ratcliffe 2008). On the flip side, disposedness equals the respective "how"'of Dasein's current dwelling in the world, in the sense of the multiplicity of ways in which its own being is an issue for it – how the world comes to specifically matter to it.

This will all become more clear when we explicate the specifically temporal character of disposedness. Right before he embarks upon the quest of a temporal reinterpretation of disposedness, Heidegger presents the upshot of his initial characterization of it by way of a succinct summary to start §68b; we can use it here to sum up the key points discussed thus far:

> the "there" gets equiprimordially disclosed by one's mood in every case – or gets closed off by it. Having a mood brings Dasein *face to face* with its thrownness in such a manner that its thrownness is not known as such but disclosed far more primordially in "how one is." Existentially, "*being*-thrown" means finding oneself in some attunement or other (*sich so oder so befinden*). One's disposedness (*Befindlichkeit*) is therefore based upon thrownness. My mood represents the specific way in which I am primarily that thrown entity. (SZ 339–40)

All the crucial points are in there: Moods disclose the facticity of Dasein's thrownness not in the manner of cognition but in a more primordial way, i.e., through "how it is for one" – which might as well – and usually does – amount to a kind of closing-off of the ᴛʜᴇʀᴇ ("*Da*"). The precise meaning of the term *Befindlichkeit* is made clear: *to find oneself "here" in this way or that*, so that one can say that mood is the specific *way* in which I am the thrown (factually situated) entity that I am. Quite fundamentally, then, moods are the *ways* of *our being*. This resonates with a gripping passage in the *Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, where Heidegger explicitly discusses the term "way" (*Weise*) as in "way of being," stating that "way" is meant in the sense of a melody that literally "sets the tone" for our being:

> it is clear that attunements [*Stimmungen*] are not merely something at hand. They themselves are precisely a fundamental manner and fundamental way of being, indeed of being-there [*Da-sein*], and this always directly includes being with one another. Attunements are ways of the being-there of Da-sein, and thus ways of being-away. An attunement is a way, not merely a form or mode, but a way [*Weise*] – in the sense of a melody that does not merely hover over the so-called proper being at hand of man, but that sets the tone for such being, i.e., attunes and determines the manner and way [*Art und Weise*] of his being. (GA29/30: 100–01)

With this, we are now well prepared to enter into the temporal reinterpretation of disposedness that Heidegger conducts in Division ɪɪ of *Being and Time* (see Blattner 2005 for a good general take on temporality in *Being and Time*). We can start from Haugeland's memorable gloss of disposedness in the form of a sigh: "Well, I guess we'll just have to go on from *here*" (Haugeland 2013, 234). Being in an affective state amounts to finding oneself "here," at this particular juncture, confronted by what has been, what is factual, what has come to be so that we have no choice but to go on from *here* – an ungrounded yet factually inevitable givenness disclosed by

moods. This "here," from which, alas, we *have* to go on, and which is specifically and saliently disclosed in affectivity, has a straightforward temporal interpretation. It presents the dimension of the past, more precisely of our "having been." There is a clear link between facticity and the past – even already on the verbal level: literally, a fact is that which "has been made," what *has come to be* (Heidegger accordingly speaks of "beenness"). Facticity can be construed as what happened or has been brought about so that it is now there, forming the inevitable backdrop, enabling condition and starting point for whatever will happen from now on. This is what affectivity discloses: the past in its continued weighing on – and setting the stage for – whatever will unfold or be done from now on. This is what the term "thrownness" makes vivid, both the burdensome character of finding oneself situated – in Heidegger's more precise terms: "delivered over" to a situation – and the inevitability of having to go on *from here* (cf. Withy 2014). The "here" indicates what we have factually become (past) so that we ended up where we're currently at (present) and thus what we will inevitably have to "drag along" when moving forward (future).

In order to grasp the specific temporal character of disposedness, we have to combine this with the peculiar way in which modes of attunement are indeed *self*-disclosive. This is what "being affected by something" amounts to: something in the world, immediately present or looming in the future, becomes manifest – impresses itself – in such a way that it makes me "roll back upon myself," so to speak. My factual being (what *I have been* and thus, in a sense, still am) dawns on me. This unfolds in such a way that the present encounter – either in an instant or in a longer sequence of becoming attuned – brings home to me affectively what I cannot deny I am. My existential beenness (past) weighs on me by forming the backdrop against which I encounter whatever thereby comes to matter – *disposing* me toward specific ways of orienting or positioning myself in the world. "Weighing on" here has the double sense of factual and affectual: by presenting an inevitable givenness, the concrete past is *felt* as a weight, as a burden in moment-to-moment existence. In this way, the existential past (beenness) is highlighted in attunement, yet this is so only in dynamic entwinement with the other temporal dimensions, present and future. Beenness only becomes manifest in this way as already *summoned toward* understanding projection, and is thus disclosed according to its relevance for prospective ways of going on (here, again, "disposedness" works well as it gets at this complex temporal dynamic of *Befindlichkeit*). Heidegger's account is here reminiscent of Husserl's construal of temporality in terms of the coordinated interplay of retention, protention, and primal impression (see Husserl 2001a). Yet, this interplay of temporal dimensions is transposed by Heidegger from the plane of an individual's experience to the unfolding of worldly events at large. *Everything* in the world adheres to this tripartite temporal dynamics, not just individual streams of consciousness. Of course, on Heidegger's account, everything *is* ultimately only in relation to – i.e., as disclosed by – Dasein (cf. SZ 230).

Thus, affectively disclosed thrownness is the burdensome "drag" that grounds projection (*Entwurf*), i.e., the inevitability of projection unfolding within a *factual* space of possibilities that one – individuals, nations, ages, institutions, etc. – cannot shake free of. (Affective) disposedness reveals the daunting inevitability of factual being, the acknowledgement of which inauthentic everyday Dasein will most likely have already evaded in diverting absorption in some worldly issue or other. In light of these characteristics, disposedness must be understood both in terms of individual comportment and in a historical-collective manner, and it is at the point of juncture between individual and collective existential temporality where things get particularly interesting.

Given this, it should now be obvious enough why Heidegger's account can serve as an excellent starting point for philosophical accounts of affectivity, and affective world-disclosure in particular (see Slaby and Stephan 2008, Withy 2015c). The perspective on temporality that is coded into the deep structure of affective comportment helps to relate even putatively fleeting affective states to more encompassing situational and worldly conditions, and moreover in a dynamical fashion that always points ahead of the concrete "now" into essentially open yet always already pre-fashioned dimensions of possibility.

Various potential ways of elaborating this core conception present themselves. For instance, one might focus on the way a collectively instituted historical facticity is effectively shaping habits, ways of being, institutions, and objective life chances in the present (cf. Ahmed 2007). This might be spelled out for an entire nation or culture, or for more circumscribed domains of practice (such as scientific disciplines, political movements, specific institutions, or traditions). Taking the temporality of disposedness as a starting point can help to bring out the extent to which human affectivity is inextricable from collective historicity, while it at the same time it lets us reckon with powerful tendencies and efforts to prevent this circumstance from surfacing explicitly (as there likely will be rampant inauthenticity on both the individual and collective plane). In this key, the philosophical study of affectivity might be mobilized as a critical means for rendering visible and making vivid ongoing histories of oppression, of violence, and their enduring consequences, and also as a means for revealing layers of distrust, dishonesty, and inauthenticity within our collective lives (see, e.g., Freeman 2015). Philosophical affect theories that stay true to this aspect of Heidegger's groundwork – while they are well advised to steer clear of some other aspects of it (see Slaby 2017a) – will not be detached, depoliticized, merely descriptive endeavors. Rather, they will concern the concrete fabric of particular strands of historical becoming, and aim at critical, transformative forms of understanding.

Jan Slaby

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Disposedness SZ 133–42, 148, 160–62, 187–91, 343–46; GA18:49, 53–55, 95–97, 163–64, 170–71, 181, 192, 242–45, 259–62; GA27:125, 328–31; GA64: 33–36; GA71:220–21
Disposedness and thrownness SZ 135; GA27:328–31
Temporality of/and disposedness SZ 339–46; GA64:111; GA71:218
Stimmung **(mood)** SZ 133–40; GA29/30:89–103

DISPOSITION (*STIMMUNG*). SEE MOOD.

DISPOSITION (*FÜGUNG*). SEE FITTINGNESS.

61.

DISPOSITION (*AUSTRAG*)

A DISPOSITION IN GENERAL is either the *process* by means of which a struggle, conflict, or dispute reaches a resolution; or it is the *condition* in which a formerly fluid, dynamic, changing situation is now settled into a more static, orderly arrangement and thus brought to a kind of completion. Heidegger is interested in ontological dispositions: the settlement of stable configurations of relations that allows entities to manifest themselves. Heidegger's metaphor for understanding the concept of a disposition is a threshold – the hardened boundary that delimits the inside from the outside and vice versa (see GA12:24/PLT 202). Without a threshold to secure and carry a doorway or gate, the distinction between in and out is insecure and vague. With a threshold in place, the relation of in and out is made stable or brought to a resolution.

Ontological dispositions are brought about through a process of ADAPTATION. Once a disposition – a stable settlement of elements into an orderly arrangement – is produced, that disposition sets the parameters for any ongoing strife or struggle over meaning or significance (see POLEMOS).

Heidegger deploys the idea of a disposition at several key points in his later writings. Different historical worlds arise through a process of disposition, disposing or resolving the struggle of interpretations into a relatively fixed arrangement. Both BEING as such and the ESSENCE OF HUMAN BEINGS are determined by bringing a disposition to the relationship between being and human being (GA8:44/41). More generally, the distinction between being and entities is understood as a disposition of the opposition between what is and the NOTHING. Early Greek philosophers, Heidegger argued, understood being to be the result of a settling of opposites into a disposition (GA7:226/EGT 71). A particular CLEARING is a disposition of BEYNG (GA67:81). Although the FOURFOLD offers a non-metaphysical basis for understanding things, it too functions by producing a disposition of disparate elements, settling EARTH and sky, mortals and divinities into a temporary disposition (GA12:19/PLT 197).

Mark A. Wrathall

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA5:69 note a/52 note a, 97/73, 365/275; GA7:197/PLT 219; GA11:71ff./ID 62ff.; GA13:31; GA15:431, 438; GA16:253, 330; GA39: 52, 98, 132, 180; GA45:175; GA48:285–86, 319; GA65:30, 38, 240, 328; GA66:64, 84, 86, 92, 167, 203, 210, 251, 307–08, 311, 314, 339, 362; GA67:26, 77–81; GA69:5–6, 25, 27–29, 43, 45, 51–90, 94–95, 101, 106–07, 109–10, 117–18, 136, 218; GA70:12–13, 34, 37, 44, 56, 67, 72, 95–96, 99, 101, 157, 180; GA75:98; GA79:56; GA85:35, 55, 110; GA90:242

DISSECTING (*ZERGLIEDERN*). SEE ARTICULATION.

DISSEMINATION OF DASEIN (*ZERSTREUUNG*). SEE DISPERSION.

DISSOCIATING EXPOSITION (*AUSEINANDERSETZUNG*). SEE CONFRONTATION.

62.
DIS-STANCE (*ENT-FERNUNG*)

"D IS-STANCE" (ENT-FERNUNG) IS DASEIN'S spatiality as "bringing-near": an entity's "far-ness" (*Ferne*) is overcome or abolished (*ent-*), and brought into the proximal ambit of Dasein's COPING engagement in the significant nexus that is its WORLD. "Distance" (*Entfernung* without a hyphen) refers to the judged distance between AVAILABLE entities in Dasein's everyday environment. Finally, "extended span" (*Abstand*) means the measurable span between OCCURRENT entities as contemplated from a theoretical perspective. Dis-stance names the primary spatiality of Dasein's BEING-IN-THE-WORLD (SZ 104–05), within which distances manifest themselves, primarily among available entities. This phenomenon underlies our pragmatic judgments of distance in everyday life, as well as the extended span (*Abstand*) between objects in space conceived as an exactly measurable manifold. Extended span is the theoretical correlate of pragmatic distance in the spatial manifold, denuded of its primordial "worldliness."

1   MORPHOLOGY AND TRANSLATION

The everyday German word for distance, *Entfernung*, consists of the root *fern*, which means "far" or "remote," and the prefix, *ent-*, which connotes "motion away from."[1] Thus, *Entfernung* is a pleonasm:[2] "distancing away." It is the substantive of the verb, *entfernen*, "to remove, to take or move away"; the reflexive form, *sich entfernen*, means "to distance or move (oneself) away (from something); to absent oneself; to go away." Heidegger's hyphen accentuates and exploits an ambiguity in the prefix *ent-*. While its usual sense is "away-ness,"[3] *ent-* may also suggest reversal or undoing of something, as in the verbs *entzaubern* (disenchant) or *entwaffnen* (disarm).[4] Heidegger's "ontological" interpretation of *Ent-fernung*, therefore, emphasizes the undoing of distance (*Ferne*), while simultaneously indicating the dependent,[5] "ontic" phenomenon of distance (*Entfernung*) as the span between two objects or locations "in space." It is this "reversive" sense that has vexed English translators: Macquarrie and Robinson try to capture what they call the "privative"[6] connotation of *ent-* with "de-severance," while Dreyfus and Stambaugh

---

[1] Cf. esp. Kühnhold 1970; and Kühnhold and Wellmann 1973a, 295. Cf. Macquarrie and Robinson on *ent-* as a "privative prefix" (BT 138 n. 2).

[2] Indeed, Kühnhold simply identifies the usual meaning of *ent- as* "Entfernen" (Kühnhold and Wellmann 1973a, 148, *ent-*[1]).

[3] This is indeed by far the most common sense of *ent-*: Kühnhold 1970, 271.

[4] Elsen 2011, 216 (reversive). See esp. SZ 105.   [5] Cf. Dreyfus 1991, 128.

[6] *Ent-* is not privative, but rather reversive of a prior condition.

propose "dis-stance" and "de-distancing," respectively.[7] This article will use "dis-stance," as best preserving the ambiguity at play in Heidegger's term.

2 DISCUSSION

Together with "orientation" or "directedness" (*Ausrichtung*), dis-stance is a basic concept in Heidegger's analysis of Dasein's spatiality. As such, he distinguishes it from traditional "theoretical" (SZ 59) categories (SZ 54, 54, 105) of SPACE and distance. On this latter view, things appear "occurrent" at various positions (*Stellen*) or loci (*Orte*, SZ 54) in a "manifold" (SZ 103)[8] of measurable relations (*Ortsverhältnisse*), both with respect to us and to each other (SZ 54). Just as things are nearer to or farther from each other, so, too, my body is nearer to or farther from other bodies in space (SZ 54; cf. esp. 201). This view of space as a positional manifold is central to a realistic (SZ 201) interpretation of being as occurrentness, which Heidegger strives to show is derived from, and explicable in terms of, Dasein's ontological structures. Philosophy's fixation on being as presence, and space as a manifold, throws up obstacles to the phenomenological grasp and explication of being and space in their most primordial manifestations. Conversely, it is everyday Dasein and its spatiality that "conceal" theoretical space (SZ 103, 104). Heidegger's task is to describe their true relationship.

Dasein is always already "in" a world of significance, manifested most immediately in the environmental nexus of equipment that encounters us in the mode of being called "being-available." Dasein's existence in this environing world is its primary and primordial way of being, and exhibits its own peculiar "spatiality" (*Räumlichkeit*): for the implements and signs constitutive of its world naturally fall out into "regions" out of which these things approach and encounter us. Dasein moves and "copes" with tacit understanding (*Verstehen*) within and among these regions. It is only when Dasein abstains from the default activity of "COPING" that inner-worldly entities – i.e., just those entities (*Seiendes*) that constitute our world as available – retreat, for their part, into the mode of being merely "occurrent," i.e., "just being there." This is the mode in which they present themselves to the pure contemplation of *theōria*, which only now construes them as located in a spatial manifold, measurable in three dimensions. Dis-stance, then, names a feature or structure of Dasein's primordial spatiality, namely the way in which entities encounter us as available. By contrast, Heidegger reserves the term *Abstand* (extended span or separating extension) to signify distance between things occurrent, e.g., as bodies located in a spatial manifold.

Dasein is "PROXIMALLY AND FOR THE MOST PART" involved with its environment. "Proximately and for the most part" translates his phrase *zunächst und zumeist*: *zunächst* literally means "next-most," and is commonly translated as "immediate" (i.e., without a medium). *Nächst* is the superlative of *nah* (near).[9] His use of "next-most" is no accident, for the equipmental environment appears to Dasein precisely as what appears closest and "most nigh" in Dasein's

---

[7] Macquarrie and Robinson: BT 138 n. 2; Dreyfus 1991, x–xi, 130.

[8] Macquarrie and Robinson translate *Mannigfaltigkeit* as "multiplicity," whereas Heidegger is clearly making a contrast with the notion of a three-dimensional manifold; cf. esp. SZ 110 (§24). This translation error persists in the literature, e.g., Dreyfus 1991, 139.

[9] Cf. English "next," the superlative of "nigh," from Old English *nēah*, "near."

coping involvement with its equipmental nexus. In other words, just because Dasein's primordial spatiality is determined by what is available (*zuhanden* – literally, "to hand"), these entities appear as "near" in just this sense: "ready to hand" or within a usable range. As Heidegger puts it: "In *Dasein* there lies an essential tendency towards nearness [*Nähe*]" (SZ 105; cf. esp. GA7:182–83/PLT 179).

This "ontological" nearness of Dasein is essential for understanding the existentiale sense of *Ent-fernung* as "dis-stance," i.e., as the "reversing [*ent-*] of the 'far' [*Ferne*]": for in the equipmental coping that is Dasein's default mode of existence, things always appear "near" *before* they are judged to be "at some distance" from Dasein. But this "nearness" signifies "im-mediate" integration into an equipmental totality (*Zeugzusammenhang*). Thus, "for the most part" (*zumeist*), the sun does not appear as a stellar object 93 million miles "away from" us, but as *proximally* (*zunächst*) a part of an ensemble of inner-worldly entities that constitute a landscape, "the out-of-doors," or "the sky"; or, in technical, "applied" contexts, as an energy source bound up in a system of solar receptors, transmission lines, and the electrical grid. In none of these cases does the measurable distance between the sun and the earth figure; never does the Sun appear as the astronomer's "stellar object" around which planets orbit, and which itself orbits around the galactic center.

Nevertheless, the sun's proximal appearance is spatial, namely as dis-stanced: it first encounters Dasein as having teleological significance (a *wozu* or "wherefore") in a network of immediate significances. Just this proximate immediacy is the existentiale meaning of nearness or nighness and *hence* the existentiale sense of dis-stance with its reversive prefix; for the primordial phenomenon of space is the "de-distancing,"[10] the abolition of the far by bringing an entity "nigh," viz. into the immediacy of the available.

Dis-stance as the primordial spatiality of Dasein furnishes the condition of possibility of the usual meaning of distance (*Entfernung*, no hyphen). This is because only once an entity has appeared to Dasein as significant-*for* some end or other, that Dasein *now* enters into a "calculative" relation with that entity regarding its "place" (*Platz*) in the equipmental nexus. Such calculation manifests itself in judgments of distance like "five minutes by car," "as the crow flies," "an arm's length," "a stone's throw away," phrases that retain an inexactitude typical of and yet perfectly appropriate to Dasein's coping with its environment.[11] Thus "distance" is derivative of the spatiality of available entities, as Dasein engages these in coping, "everyday" calculation.

This brings us finally to Heidegger's notion of *Abstand* or "extended span," i.e., the extent separating one locus or thing from another, by how far it *stands* away from (*ab-*) the other. As opposed to the inexact "distance" (*Entfernung*) among available entities, judged by Dasein "on the fly," *Abstand* is reserved for the exact measure between entities occurrent, seen from a disengaged, theoretical perspective. Thus, for Heidegger, extended spans are only possible in a mathematized space, conceived as a (three-dimensional) manifold, never "in the world" of lived equipmental engagement. But because near- and far-ness (*Nähe*, *Ferne*) only pertain to dis-stance and distance – i.e., to Dasein's spatiality and the available entities that encounter it (*begegnendes Zuhandenes*) – one cannot speak of occurrent entities as being "near" or "far" from each other. Their "distance" can only be expressed in neutral terms of spatial extension, like microns, meters, or parsecs.

Alan Kim

---

[10] To use Stambaugh's translation.   [11] Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1.3, 1094b11ff.

FURTHER READING

Arisaka 1995, Dreyfus 1991

DISTINCTION (*UNTERSCHEIDUNG*). SEE DIFFERENCE.

DISTRACTION (*ZESTREUUNG*). SEE DISPERSION.

DISTRESS (*NOT*). SEE EMERGENCY.

DIVISION (*GLIEDERUNG*). SEE JOINTEDNESS.

DRAFT (*RIß*). SEE RIFT.

DREAD (*ANGST*). SEE ANXIETY.

DWELL/DWELLING (*AUFENTHALT*). SEE SOJOURN.

63.
DWELLING (*WOHNEN*)

Dwelling consists in being in one's world as in a "homeland" (*Heimat*, GA9:338/257), in being "at home." (Since English has both "dwelling" and "living," whereas German has only *wohnen*, it is easier to capture the notion of dwelling in English than in German.) The concept of dwelling comes to prominence in Heidegger's later thought.

Following Hölderlin, Heidegger thinks the essence of dwelling "from out of the homelessness of contemporary man" (*ibid*.), a homelessness which represents the fundamental character of the "destitution" of modernity (GA5:269/PLT 89; GA7:163–64/PLT 159). What makes homelessness thus fundamental is that dwelling is the human essence: "to be a human being means . . . to dwell." This is something "told" to us by language: the German first and second person verbs *bin* and *bist*, the distinctively human forms of the infinitive *sein*, the verb "to be," are (as the Grimm brothers' 1854 dictionary tells us) derived from the Old High German and Old English *buan*, which means "to dwell" (GA7:148–49/PLT 144–45). This raises the question of whether, if dwelling is the human essence and modern humanity is homeless, we have lost our humanity. Not so, says Heidegger. Our homelessness lies, not in the fact that we do not dwell, but rather in our failure to "experience and take over" our dwelling (GA9:338/257). Mostly, modern human beings are "blind" to their dwelling. But blindness, Heidegger points out, "is only possible in a being who, in its essence, is endowed with sight" (GA7:206/PLT 225).

Although the discussion of dwelling occurs mainly in Heidegger's later thought, the notion is not entirely absent from *Being and Time*, where its importance is also established via an excursion into the Grimms' dictionary. Although there is no explicit mention of *buan*, here, too, Heidegger claims that *ich bin*, "I am," originally meant *ich wohne*, "I dwell." Rather, however, than connecting dwelling to being in a homeland, he connects it to "being amidst [*bei*]" the network of "equipment" that constitutes one's world. "I am," he says, means "to be amidst . . . ," "to be familiar with . . . [*vertraut mit* . . .]" (SZ 54). So, for example, the carpenter "dwells" in his workshop because he is familiar with – and in *that* sense "at home" with – his tools, materials, and workplace – in a way in which he would probably not be "at home" in, say, a computer lab.

What, however, makes dwelling a diminished notion in *Being and Time* is that early Heidegger regards existential anxiety (*Angst*) about the "nothingness" that shows up in death, as at least "latent" in all Dasein, so that human existence is *essentially uncanny* (*unheimlich*, the ordinary meaning of the word; see Uncanniness), "not-at-home," on account of our being (as its etymological components – *un-heim-lich* – tell us, SZ 188–89). We – *all* human beings at all times and places – are "homeless." This means that, in *Being and Time*, "being at home" *cannot* mean anything more than "being familiar with."

In "Building Dwelling Thinking" (1951/54), later Heidegger's most extended discussion of dwelling, he explicitly rejects *Being and Time*'s diminished notion as a notion of dwelling: "the chief engineer is at home [in *Being and Time*'s sense] in the power station but he does not dwell there" (GA7:147/PLT 143–44).

The contrast between dwelling in the later sense of "being in a homeland" and the earlier sense of "being familiar with" ("knowing one's way around in") reveals the spiritual depth of the "TURN (*Kehre*)" in Heidegger's "path of thinking" which, he says, occurred during the 1930s (GA9:327–28/249–50). For early Heidegger, human beings are essentially homeless, incapable of dwelling in the proper sense of the word. For later Heidegger, human beings are essentially dwellers – albeit that modern humanity has temporarily lost touch with its "essence." What, therefore, later Heidegger's rejection of *Being and Time*'s conception of "dwelling" amounts to is a quiet admission that that work is not, as it hoped to be, an account of the transcendental structure of human being *as such*, but rather (at least in the material mostly to be found in Division II) a testimony to the homelessness of *contemporary* humanity.

Heidegger identifies three central aspects of the homelessness of modernity. The first is (in Hölderlin's phrase) the "default of God" and the gods, a default which, since dwelling "in the sight of the gods" is "the ground of the possibility that man can become . . . a community [*Volk*]" (GA39:216), means that we are incapable of the "community" that *Being and Time* identifies as the "authentic" mode of being with one another (SZ 122). Heidegger is here rehearsing a long-established tradition of German thought which distinguishes "community" from mere "society" in terms of its possessing what Hegel called "ethical substance" and early Heidegger "heritage" (SZ 383–86), a shared conception of the good life which provides the ultimate ground of meaning for all members of the community.

As *Being and Time* notes, heritage is memorialized in the narratives of the lives of exemplary ethical "heroes" – "the gods" in later Heidegger's language. Collectively, these exemplars must embody a coherent, unitary *ethos* (a unitary "myth," as Nietzsche puts it) and in that sense they must all be embraced by, as later Heidegger puts it, a unitary "godhead" (GA7:151/PLT 150). It is intuitively evident that, without "the others" among whom one lives providing the intimacy of community, something is lacking in one's at-homeness in the world.

The second aspect of modern homelessness is precisely the "anxiety" about death that *Being and Time* takes to be inescapable: our inability to, in Rilke's phrase, "read the word 'death' *without* negation" (GA5:303/PLT 122). Again, it is intuitively clear, that if one's BEING-IN-THE-WORLD is blighted by at best repressed anxiety one cannot be said to be properly "at-home" in that world.

The third aspect of homelessness lies in the care-less violence of modern TECHNOLOGY. Modern technology "sets upon" (GA7:16/QCT 15) a world disclosed to it as nothing but a store of "resources," human and otherwise, available for unconditional exploitation. Again there is an intuitive connection between lack of care and lack of dwelling. The chief engineer does not care for the power station in the way in which he cares for his home and garden.

These three aspects of modern life add up, then, to our loss of dwelling. But just what is it we have lost? What, in Heidegger's language, is the "essence," the "enabling ground" (GA9:177/136 fn.), of dwelling? He takes two approaches to this question, one in terms of his own meditative "thinking" and one via an "elucidation" of Hölderlin's poetry, an elucidation that follows the path of biblical hermeneutics in presupposing the absolute truth of the poet's insight. Although poetry and thinking (*Dichten und Denken*) do not do it in the same way, Heidegger takes it that (in this case, at least) they say "the same" (GA7:197/PLT 216).

In terms of Heidegger's "thinking" about being and truth, dwelling is being in (as he sometimes puts it, "ek-sisting," "standing out into," GA9:332/254) the "TRUTH of being" (GA9:319/243). Expressed in conceptual terms, this is a matter of apprehending three things. First, as is

pointed out in §44 of *Being and Time*, that truth is disclosure: that propositional truth presupposes a disambiguation of reality, a prior "disclosure" of a realm of entities that can constitute a domain of reference. Second, that disclosure (or "CLEARING") is "concealment," so that concealed by, for instance, a world of middle-sized, commonsense objects is the world of quarks and black holes, not to mention the Martians' world of four-dimensional space-time worms. (Heidegger identifies the explicit awareness that disclosure is concealment as coming to him in 1930 and as constituting the beginning of "the turn" (GA9:328/250).) What follows from this is that, concealed by the "horizon" that constitutes our world, is "the MYSTERY" (GA9:194/148). In contrast to the "depth-less" world of *Being and Time* (SZ 152), the world that is surrounded by an empty nothingness, being now acquires a hidden dimension which, since its depth is incalculable, is "awesome" (GA5:55/PLT 65), awesome in the manner of Kant's "mathematical sublime."

The third insight required to fully grasp the "truth of being" (this constitutes the second phase of Heidegger's "turn," the transition to "*Ereignis* thinking" in about 1936) is to see that "the mystery" is not only awesome but is also gift-giving: the clearing of being that gives us the clearing that is our world is not a human achievement but is rather "gifted" to us in the "ADAPTATION" (*Ereignis*) of BEYNG. To see this is for the mystery to "ad-apt" (*er-eignen*) us to itself. In a state of spiritual health, we experience a deep and festive "gratitude" (*das Danken*, GA52:197) for the "favor" (*die Gunst*) that has been bestowed on us (GA9:310/236), for "the wonder that around us a world worlds, that there is something rather than nothing, that there are things and we ourselves are in their midst" (GA52:64).

How does this "*Ereignis* experience," this experience of "transport and captivation" (GA65:70), help overcome homelessness? In the famous passage in *The Gay Science* (§125) in which Nietzsche announces the "death of God" he also says that "we" have "killed" him. Heidegger provides an account of how we have done this. The loss of the gods has happened, he says, on account of something "even grimmer," the loss of the "divine radiance" (*Glanz der Gottheit*); of, that is, the "ether" in which alone gods can be gods (GA5:269/PLT 89–90). What we have lost is the medium in which alone "the gods" can "shine," can have the charismatic authority, the power that is not force, to bind us into authentic community. Essentially, Heidegger is here rehearsing Max Weber's observation that "dis-enchantment" is the defining feature of modernity, a disenchantment caused by "rationalization" or, as Heidegger calls it, "the INVENTORY" (see also SYN- THETIC COM-POSIT(ION)ING). If, then, we have turned away from the inventory and into the truth of being, then our world becomes re-enchanted so that, once more, the gods can shine for us. As individuals, of course, we cannot *make* it happen that there is a community-wide return to the gods of our ethical tradition – we cannot *make* the "world turning" (GA5:270/PLT 90) happen. We cannot force the rebirth of community, and we should resist the attempt to "make" gods who, as manufactured, are false "idols" (Hitler, for example) (GA7:152/PLT 148). And so even if we, as individuals, dwell in the truth of being, our dwelling cannot be complete until the others, our "relatives" as Hölderlin calls them, also make the "homecoming" into that truth (GA4:9–31/24–49). This does not, however, mean that one who dwells lacks community. Hölderlin is fully aware of his "relatedness" to the relatives even though they are not yet aware of their relatedness to him. It does mean that his dwelling is touched by a "holy mourning" (GA39:146) of the fact that, for the others, the gods are still absent.

Dwelling in the truth of being overcomes anxiety about death, renders one capable of the "good death" (GA7:152–53/PLT 148), because, in being "adapted," "appropriated,"

"captivated," "made its own" by the mystery, one transcends one's mortal self and *becomes* the mystery. Heidegger finds Rilke's notion of the visible world as the "unheard-of centre's" "venture" illuminating in this regard (GA5:275–88/PLT 97–108). In "ecstatic" (GA9:332/253) self-transcendence, one *becomes* "the center." And as the "center" one enters "the free," a domain in which one is "preserved from harm and threat," including the ultimate threat of death (GA7:150–51/PLT 147). Free of "anxiety," one experiences the ontological security which Wittgenstein describes as "feeling safe whatever happens."

Finally, dwelling in the truth of being reveals one's world as a "holy" place (GA5:272/PLT 92) in which modern technological practice shows up as a desecration. In its place, being-in-the-world becomes "caring-for" (*schonen*, GA7:151–53/PLT 147–48) the entities with which we share our world. Of course, as human beings we must and should make changes to our environment. But such changes will have the character, not of violation, but rather "bringing forth" (*poiêsis*), completion (see BUILDING).

All of the foregoing "thinking" about being and dwelling is, says Heidegger, captured more profoundly in the lines of Hölderlin's poetry which read "Full of merit [for his many technological achievements] yet poetically dwells / man upon this earth." What great POETRY does is to reveal the "unknown God" in the sight of "familiar" things. Poetry lets us see, as purely conceptual thought cannot, "what conceals itself." (Poetry is thus deeper, "more rigorous," than conceptual thought, GA5:357/271: it enables us to "grasp . . . what is ungraspable," GA53:169–70/136). In revealing the concealed, *as* the concealed, it opens up the "dimension" that is hidden from modern humanity, the dimension of the "holy." Thereby, it "measures out" a place for dwelling (GA7:191–208/PLT 209–27).

This place is four-dimensional: human lives are bounded by earth, climate, social norms, and time. If, however, they *dwell*, then this place shows up "poetically." In the fulness of its holy mystery, it is transformed into "the FOURFOLD" (*das Geviert*): the astronomer's "earth" is transformed into the poet's "building bearer," the geographer's "climate" into the poet's "year's seasons, the gloom and glow of night, the clemency and inclemency of the weather," the sociologist's social "norms" into the poet's "beckoning messengers of the godhead," and temporal finitude into being "mortal," being, that is, "capable of death as death," accepting death as the "shrine of the nothing," as the "shelter of being" (GA7:151–53, 179–84/PLT 147–49, 171–78). By inhabiting "the poetic" – living in the "truth of being" – dwellers are surrounded by the aura of the sacred mystery. As a result they are in community with their "relatives," face death with "RELEASEMENT" or "equanimity" (*Gelassenheit*), and, in "gratitude," care-for their world as for a precious gift.

Julian Young

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 54; GA4:9–31/24–49; GA5:269–320/200–41; GA7:145–64, 189–208/PLT 145–61, 213–29; GA9:313–64/239–76

E

64.
EARTH (*ERDE*)

E ARTH IS THAT which is self-secluding and at the same time inexhaustibly and sponta-
neously creative. It both withdraws into concealment, and sustains or supports the appear-
ance of emergent possibilities.

Heidegger's interpretation of earth (*Erde*) is most well known through his analysis of the strife
between earth and world in the 1936 talk "The Origin of the Work of Art," where earth is
distinguished by its spontaneity and self-seclusion. However, Heidegger's formative insights
into earth are first articulated in the 1934/35 lecture course, *Hölderlin's Hymns "Germania" and
"The Rhine"* (GA39), in which this word is given terminological significance in the context of
Heidegger's reading of Hölderlin. Indeed, the meaning Heidegger assigns to "earth" derives
from his interpretation of several key passages from Hölderlin hymns, the most notable of
which is the line from "In beautiful blue … ": "Full of merit, yet poetically dwell / Human
beings upon this earth." Though Heidegger's interpretation of earth undergoes several impor-
tant reconceptualizations between 1934 and such later essays as "The Thing" (1950) – and this
primarily concerns how earth comes to appear *as earth* within a conflictual or differential
structure – earth as a term is distinguished by (1) its self-seclusion and concealment, (2) the
necessity that that concealment appear *as a concealment* and thus as the enigmatic limit of all
human MACHINATION (*techne*), (3) the connection between the experience of limitation and the
human being's finitude articulated as the human being's "poetically DWELLING," and (4) the
relationship between concealment and the sheltering of emergent possibility, which connects
earth to historical errancy and the finitude of truth within the larger context of Heidegger's
work in the 1930s. Heidegger's reading of Hölderlin in the *"Germania" and "The Rhine"* course
explicitly ties earth to homeland by way of the divine; Heidegger's predominant characteriza-
tion of earth in that course is "the earth as homeland" (*die heimatliche Erde*). And while it would
be incorrect to conceive of earth as itself political, as the articulation of finite limitation
Heidegger initially understands earth to connect the human being's mortality to the historical
configuring of nature and a people through the notion of poetic dwelling. This connection,
which is residually evident in "The Origin of the Work of Art," falls out in the 1950s when
Heidegger radicalizes the way he conceives the relationship between earth and mortal errancy,
becoming-at-home and technicity, in his interpretation of the FOURFOLD.

Heidegger's first terminological reference to earth is found in his analysis of Hölderlin's
"Germania" hymn, when the human being, in mourning the flight of the old gods, comes to
experience "*the power of the earth*" (GA39:88/80). In what becomes a sustained structural motif,
earth is disclosed only by being set into relief against the divine – strife in the *"Germania" and
"The Rhine"* course is configured between the gods and earth – and is shown to possess two
further aspects: the dissolution of every form (this importantly includes the individuation of the
"I"), and the insight into poetic dwelling undergone as the experience of the human being's
"*belonging* to the earth." Heidegger develops the implicit connection between these two aspects
in emphasizing the abyssal quality of earth as the "withdrawal" and "sinking away" of all ground,

which he understands to bring the human being into her mortal finitude as she reaches into the ABYSS as the uncreated reserve of all emergence. The key line from Hölderlin's "Germania" hymn, and the one that informs Heidegger's own understanding of earth as seclusion, concealment, but also the creativity of birth, reads: " . . . For almost like the holy one / Who is Mother of all [viz. Earth], and carries the abyss / Otherwise named the Concealed One [*die Verborgene*] by humans . . . " (lines 75–77). While Heidegger's various characterizations of earth in "The Origin of the Work of Art" lend themselves to the reimposition of the Aristotelean categories of formal and material cause, in its withdrawal into self-concealment earth for Heidegger is instead aligned with emergent possibility, whose "quivering" being held in reserve is tied both to earth's spontaneity and its inexhaustibility as the expression of creative origination.

An additional note of clarification on the conflictual relation between gods and earth in the *"Germania" and "The Rhine"* course is required, and helps contextualize the way Heidegger reconceives the strife between earth and world in "The Origin of the Work of Art," whose structure he further radicalizes as the appropriating/expropriating "mirror play" between earth, sky, divinities, and mortals in the fourfold. First, Heidegger claims that "the Heavenly" cannot reach into the darkness of the abyss that earth bears. In being placed beneath the divine in reaching into earth's concealment through the creative violence of what Heidegger for the first time calls a "work," the human being is actively brought into her mortal finitude "upon the earth"; rather than being conceived as a traditional metaphysical transcendence toward the divine, gods and earth first enter into relation with one another through this "beneath" and "upon," as the gods "tear" into the darkness of the earth as each term is delimited through its conflict with the other as the occurrence of a historical "world." In the 1951 talk, " . . . Poetically Man Dwells . . . , " Heidegger goes on to articulate this structure of the human being's dimensional spanning as a being "between" earth and sky, which circumscribes the human being as mortal and designates what Heidegger means by the expression "poetic dwelling." Second – and this point most directly anticipates "The Origin of the Work of Art" – in his topology of the springing forth of the Rhine river Heidegger opposes earth as "birth" to "ray of light," which he understands as the assuming of "figure" and limitation that wrests earth from self-withdrawal into darkness and concealment. However, rather than "birth" and "ray of light" being opposed to one another as occurrent entities, they first come to emerge as what they are only from out of the unity of their conflict, which sets them into relation to one another in setting them apart in the appearance of what is concealed in its concealment. As Heidegger writes, "figure, however, is both inner delimitation bringing itself to a stand and entry into the dark, into which it closes itself off as into the gravity of what has been overcome. What is dark, by contrast, does not lose its unfettered character in the configuring light of delimitation, but lets it become conspicuous" (GA39:243).

Heidegger's insight into the conflictual unity of the darkness of earth and the structure of appearance as delimitation is transformed into the strife between earth and world in "The Origin of the Work of Art." And here Heidegger's most important modification is the greater emphasis he places on earth's coming to appear within the context of world in its self-concealing withdrawal and thus as world's own internal limit. Heidegger's understanding of earth most clearly emerges in his description of a Greek temple when he writes: "standing there, the building rests on the rocky ground. This resting of the work draws up out of the rock the obscurity of that rock's bulky yet spontaneous support. . . . The luster and gleam of the stone, though itself apparently glowing only by the grace of the sun, yet first brings to radiance the

light of the day, the breadth of the sky, the darkness of night" (GA5:28/PLT 41). While this passage seems to emphasize the material make-up of the temple, what Heidegger means by earth becomes manifest as the emerging into visibility of what otherwise withdraws – namely, the weight of rock as the thrusting upward of spontaneous support and the gleam of stone as the letting be seen of the expanse of the sky apart from the individual things its illumination makes visible. This importantly distinguishes the work of art from a piece of equipment, where what the equipment is made of wears out through its use while the withdrawing into concealment of earth in the work of ART gives it its "repose" as a GATHERING and sheltering. Though Heidegger is careful to distinguish between NATURE and earth, recalling Heraclitus' famous dictum that "nature loves to hide," Heidegger connects the sheltering quality of earth to *phusis* as the generativity of what emerges and arises out of itself (see EMERGENCE).

Where the *"Germania" and "The Rhine"* course understands strife to be configured between gods and earth as the occurrence of world, "The Origin of the Work of Art" conceptualizes world in terms of the originating and configuring of a "work," which Heidegger interprets as the "region" in which things first receive their look in coming to appear *as* what they are. At this juncture, the implicit asymmetry inherent in the relation between earth and world emerges in the specific structuring of their conflict. For as Heidegger elaborates, "the work moves the earth itself into the open region of a world and keeps it there. *The work lets the earth be earth*" (GA5:32/ PLT 45). Where the example of the temple showed how the work of art "lets the earth be earth" by revealing it in its concealment and self-withdrawal, the structure of world forces this withdrawal into appearance; world is unable to let earth withdraw into its own self-withdrawal as what remains completely hidden. At the same time, however, world's enigmatic revelation of such hiddenness is simultaneously revealed to be world's own disclosive limit as a making visible whose original source is darkness and concealment. Heidegger touches on this in describing the counter-movement of earth's relation to world as "a sheltering and concealing [that] tends always to draw the world into itself and keep it there" (GA5:35/PLT 47).

Although the term "earth" frequently appears within the context of Heidegger's various lecture courses and talks on Hölderlin, Heidegger's final reconceptualization of earth occurs in his elaboration of the "fourfold" in such talks as "Building Dwelling Thinking" (1951) and "The Thing" where it is one component of a differential unity that includes sky, divinities, and mortals. On the whole, Heidegger says little about earth beyond describing it in terms that reiterate the connection with *phusis* as self-emergence, blossoming, and unfolding. In fact, the detailed analysis of earth tends to be absorbed within Heidegger's broader treatment of poetic dwelling and the role mortals play within the fourfold as its "preserver." However, what distinguishes Heidegger's interpretation in these later essays is the restructuring of strife as the differential "freeing" of each term in relation to all the others, which Heidegger connects to the notion of "sparing" as leaving something beforehand in its own nature. In "Building Dwelling Thinking" it thus falls to mortals to "save the earth," which, similar to the work in "The Origin of the Work of Art," requires the making of a space (Heidegger conceives this as "location") for earth to appear as earth through which mortals come into their own essence in dwelling "upon the earth." In elaborating the relation between earth and sky through the example of the Heidelberg bridge, Heidegger writes that its arches "leave the river's water to run its course.... Even where the bridge covers the stream, it holds its flow up to the sky by taking it for a moment under the vaulted gateway and setting it free once more"

(GA7:154/PLT 150). In developing the relationship between world and thing in the essay "The Thing," Heidegger articulates such freeing as a "mirror play" and "ring dance" in which each term of the fourfold is expropriated into its own being within a structure of mutual ADAPTATION (GA7:180–81/PLT 177). Where the strife between earth and world was interpreted as a figuring and delimitation whose look inaugurated the relational nexus of world, Heidegger's later essays are concerned with the possibility of nearness, whose gathering into relation is articulated not as a wresting from concealment but as a differential playing between within which earth is just one term.

Julia Ireland

FURTHER READING

Dreyfus 2017b, Wrathall 2011, 195–211

ECHO (*ANKLANG*). SEE RESONATING.

65.
ECSTASIS (*EKSTASE*)

Ecstasis is a state or condition of being outside of oneself. Dasein, for Heidegger, is an ecstatic entity: it "stands out" beyond its particular location, into a WORLD and into the three dimensions of TIME.

For the predominant traditional Western concept of BEING, which Heidegger designates as occurrentness (see OCCURRENT), entities are bounded by determinate spatiotemporal locations and identities. An entity is what it is, and is where and when it is. But this conception cannot apply to human beings. "The human being is a creature [*Wesen*] of distance" (GA26:25) whose own being is an issue for it and who necessarily extends past its narrow, occurrent spatiotemporal location into a broader and richer SPACE and time.

The term *Da-sein* ("being there" and "being the there") already connotes a certain ecstasis, as does the term "existence" as ek-sistence or standing out (GA9:326/249). "Dasein is its disclosedness" (SZ 133) and Dasein is its there (SZ 143). That is, Dasein is not simply located at a point in space, but is able to understand, appropriate, and investigate a wealth of entities within a relatively familiar region. Apart from this region, Dasein could not be. In this sense, Dasein *is* its own world: it provides the meaningful forum within which all entities can be discovered. Dasein is an illuminated space in which entities can make sense and can be encountered.

Likewise, and perhaps more fundamentally, "*each Dasein is itself 'time'*" (GA64:57). Dasein is its own present, in which it encounters and deals with present entities, but it is also its having-been and its to-be, the past and future dimensions of its being. Heidegger refers to the future, past, and present dimensions of TEMPORALITY as ecstases because they are ways in which Dasein "stands out" from any narrowly defined present instant or "now." Thus, temporality is the original "outside-itself" or *ekstatikon* (SZ 329). Dasein stands out into the present world that it inhabits; into the possibilities that it projects; and into the THROWNNESS or having-been that is allotted to it.

It is impossible to understand Dasein's ecstatic way of being simply by ascertaining facts that pertain to it at a particular spatiotemporal cross-section, as it were – its properties at an instant – or even by a series of such facts at different instants. Dasein is always more than it factually is: it cannot be reduced to its occurrent characteristics, but demands to be understood in terms of the possibilities into which it has been thrown and which it is pursuing (SZ 145, 236).

Heidegger refers to the three authentic temporal ecstases as REPETITION (or retrieve, in Stambaugh's translation), the MOMENT of vision, and anticipation; their inauthentic counterparts are forgetting, making-present, and awaiting (SZ 336–39, 350). Whether authentic or inauthentic, these dimensions of time are always ecstatic and involve meaningful relations to entities. The common representation of time as a continuum of punctiform "nows" is a theoretical abstraction from the ecstatic and meaningful character of temporality; this picture presupposes inauthentic, and ultimately authentic, temporality (SZ 408).

The threefold ecstatic structure of time can be summed up as the future that presences as having-been (SZ 326, 350). Although the three temporal ecstases are necessarily

interconnected, the ecstasis of the future is primary (SZ 329, 339). It is by virtue of the future that Dasein is confronted with its own being as an issue. That is, it is faced with the question of *who* it is because it must adopt some possible way of being. Dasein is "*being out toward* what it is not yet, but can be" (GA64:46). In terms of this ultimate possibility, or "FOR-THE-SAKE-OF-WHICH," our more immediate options gain their sense, as do the possible ways of being of the other entities we encounter (SZ 43, 86, 145).

The present as well as the past gain significance thanks to the possibilities with regard to which we interpret them. The future ecstasis thus brings the other ecstases into relief, or makes them meaningful. "Only in so far as Dasein *is* as an 'I-*am*-as-having been', can Dasein come towards itself futurally in such a way that it comes *back*. . . . The character of 'having been' arises, in a certain way, from the future" (SZ 326). In other words, adopting a possible way to be requires making something of what one already finds oneself to be: one has to take up one's own past as a necessary burden and as an inheritance. Dasein "*is* its past, whether explicitly or not" (SZ 20). Whether we take our condition for granted or appropriate it creatively, we have been "thrown" into a milieu. We experience this thrownness as MOOD, which plays an essential role in disclosing the world (SZ §29).

The authentic retrieval of the past is "proper becoming-present" (GA64:94): it "discloses the current Situation of the 'there'" (SZ 326) and achieves a "moment of vision" (SZ 328, 338). Presence, then, is at its fullest not when time is suspended or when we live only in the "now" (as if such things were possible), but when we draw most authentically on the future and past dimensions of our being.

Being and Time proposes that time is the "horizon" for any understanding of being (SZ 1, 17, 235). In other words, our ecstatic temporality makes it possible for any way of being, of any sort of entity, to mean something to us. Heidegger works toward supporting this thesis by affirming that each temporal ecstasis discloses a "horizonal schema" in terms of which certain modes of being are understood (SZ 365; GA24:429–44). For example, the futural ecstasis brings forth "the horizon of possibility in general, within which a definite possible can be expected" (GA26:269). These ontological horizons are unified in the same way as the temporal ecstases are unified (GA26:269). It was along these lines that Heidegger planned to provide a Temporal (*temporale*) interpretation of being in *Being and Time*, Part 1, Division III (see TEMPORALITY).

Heidegger abandoned this project in its systematic form in order to pursue new questions about the "originary time" when "time 'comes to be'" (GA39:109) and we enter the condition of being-there. But in later texts such as the *Contributions to Philosophy* he still describes time as ecstatic (GA65:189, 195, 302). Rather than formulating a set of interrelated senses of being that are organized by Dasein's temporality, he now takes that temporality as a "CLEARING" in which being may come to pass more fully, or "gather itself in its essence"; we can only prepare for such an event (GA65:242).

The concept of ecstasis persists in late texts such as the *Zollikon Seminars* of the 1950s and 1960s, where human existence, including our bodily being, is described as "ecstatic" (e.g., Z 209–11/164–5, 228–29/182–83, 242/194–5).

According to a marginal note on "Time and Being," Dasein's ecstatic temporality arises from the finitude of ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*) (GA14:50). We might gloss this note by observing that adaptation is understood as finite not in contrast to the infinite, but in terms of "the own" (*das Eigene*, GA14:64). By bringing Dasein into its own, adaptation generates ecstatic temporality. Dasein can enter into a relation to its *own* being only if it is "*thrown possibility* through and

through" (SZ 144): it has been brought face to face with its own possible ways of being. In other words, in order to be confronted with ownness, Dasein must have a future, past, and present.

It can be helpful to compare Heidegger's conception of ecstasis to Augustine's understanding of time. For Augustine, it is through recollection and anticipation that the soul extends beyond the infinitesimal now and has a past and future (*Confessions* 11.27–28). This is a form of ecstatic consciousness. However, Heidegger attempts to find a more fundamental structure underlying such particular and explicit forms of awareness. Thus, for example, both remembering and forgetting depend on the ecstasis of having-been (SZ 339): only what can matter to us as part of our having-been can be forgotten or recalled. Similarly, anticipation, along with every other mode of relating to the possible, depends on the ecstasis of the future; thus, projection is not deliberate planning or envisioning, but a movement that is always already in effect before such plans arise (SZ 145). To put it in a formula, Heidegger finds the ontological basis of the acts of consciousness described by Augustine.

A similar point could be made about the relation between Heidegger's conception of ecstasis and Husserl's phenomenology of internal time consciousness; such consciousness, along with all intentionality, is grounded on the "outside-itself," a transcendence or ecstasis that is proper to Dasein's way of being (SZ 366). Furthermore, Husserl's phenomenological analyses of time focus on observational experience (hearing and remembering a series of tones) rather than on the deeper phenomenon of caring engagement with the issue of who one is.

One can object that Heidegger fails to provide a clear account of the derivation of ordinary, sequential, chronological time from the supposedly more primordial ecstatic temporality. It can also be objected that Heidegger is unclear on whether this primordial temporality requires authentic existence, or is rather the presupposition for any existence, authentic or inauthentic. Heidegger was among his own harshest critics, as regards his original project of answering the question of the meaning of being in terms of Dasein's temporal structure. Nevertheless, his analysis of the ecstatic character of our being stands as a landmark of twentieth-century phenomenology.

Richard Polt

FURTHER READING

Blattner 1999, Dahlstrom 1995, Dastur 1999, Krell 2015, Krell 1986, Luchte 2008, Nicholson 1986, Polt 2010

EFFECTIVE REALITY (*WIRKLICHKEIT*). SEE ACTUALITY.

66.
EK-SISTENCE (*EK-SISTENZ*)

EK-SISTENCE IS A condition of being outside of oneself, of not fully coinciding with oneself or being reducible to one's current properties. The ek-sistent, Heidegger explains, is "set outside of itself," "ex-posed" (*aus-setzend*, GA9:189/144). Human EXISTENCE, Heidegger argues, is ek-sistent in this sense.

At the beginning of *Being and Time*, Heidegger introduces his account of human existence or DASEIN in a way that challenges the traditional interpretation, one that regards existence in terms of substances with objectively present characteristics. For Heidegger, the existence of beings or entities has generally been understood in relation to "what-like" characteristics. (e.g., shape, size, or function; psychical or material composition; genetic structure, etc.) Thus, in the tradition of Western ontology, if one is to know "that" something is (*existentia*), one needs to know "what" it is (*essentia*). But Dasein is to be understood not in terms of "*what* we are" but "*how* we are." "So when we designate this entity with the term 'Dasein,'" writes Heidegger, "we are expressing not its 'what' (as if it were a table, house or tree) but its BEING" (SZ 42). He clarifies this point in the following way:

> whether [Dasein] "is composed of" the physical, psychical, and spiritual and how these realities are to be determined is here left completely unquestioned. . . . What is to be determined is not an outward appearance of this entity but from the outset and throughout *its way to be*, not the what of that of which it is composed but the *how of its being and the characters of this how*. (GA20:207/154)

Dasein is not a static, objectively present substance but a unique self-interpreting "movedness" (*Bewegtheit*) or *way of being* that already understands how "to be" in the world and embodies a tacit CARE and concern for its own being. To distinguish Dasein's existence from that of other entities, Heidegger gives it the special designation, "existence" (*Existenz*). But in order to grasp what Heidegger means by existence, we have to go back to the older Greek term, *Ekstatikon* (GA24:267/377; see ECSTASIS).

Against the ordinary view of ecstatis as a rapturous feeling or state of mind, Heidegger interprets the word literally as "ex-stasis," that is, to "stand" (*stasis*) "outside" (*ex*) itself. This is why, in a crucial passage in *Being and Time*, Heidegger refers to the uniqueness or peculiarity of Dasein in terms of its "not being closed-up" (*Unverschlossenheit*) because it is already open to entities by standing or stepping out beyond itself (SZ 132–33). And the ecstatic character of Dasein's existence is "TEMPORALITY" (*Zeitlichkeit*). Thus, Heidegger says "Temporality is *the original 'outside-of-itself'*, the ekstatikon" (GA24:267/377). Ecstatic temporality, for Heidegger, has nothing to do with our ordinary conception of clock-time; it is not a datable entity or a linear sequence of "nows" that is external to us. Rather, the meaning of Dasein's being *is* TIME, and ecstatic time "*temporalizes itself*" in the course of our existence. And the primary structure or *ecstasis* of this temporalizing movement is "the future" (*Zukunft*) (SZ 327).

To say that Dasein exists in the future is to say that in our everyday acts and practices we already stand outside or "run ahead of" (*vorlaufen*) ourselves into possibilities that are *not yet*. This means we understand or interpret who we are in terms of a horizon of possibilities (the *Da* or "there" of Dasein) that we project for ourselves. Insofar as I exist, I am not simply here in the present moment. I am, rather, already ahead of myself, always pressing forward into possible self-interpretations and ways of being that will, in turn, give shape to and define my identity. I am able to interpret myself as a college professor, for example, because I project for myself a certain task or "FOR-THE-SAKE-OF-WHICH" (*das Wormwillen*) that constitutes this identity, tasks such as attaining credentials, giving lectures, writing articles, and meeting with students. But insofar as I press forward into the future, this interpretive, meaning-giving horizon also stretches or moves backward into the past, into what Heidegger calls, our "having-been-ness" (*Gewesenheit*). This means that the possibilities I project for myself are always informed by the socio-historical situation into which I have been acculturated or "thrown" (*geworfen*). The identity of a college professor makes sense to me in the way that it does only insofar as I am socially and historically thrown, in this case, into a situation of being a relatively educated, intellectually curious man in the twenty-first century. This is a situation where a professional philosopher is an identity that counts and matters to me in a particular way, and because of this it is one I choose to project for myself. This is why Heidegger says that in the course of our day-to-day lives (i.e., in the ecstasis of the present), Dasein is a "thrown project" (SZ 145); it *is* both *not yet* (futural) and what it *was* (having-been). (GA24:265/375). Understood this way, the temporal ecstases that stretch forward and backward out of the present cannot be regarded as an ordered or successive sequence of events, that is, the future does not come after the past. Rather, past, present, and future are bound together in a manifold temporalizing unity. "The future is *not later* than having been, and having-been is *not earlier* than the present. Temporality temporalizes itself as a future which makes present in a process of having been" (SZ 401). For Heidegger, the ecstases of past, present, and future each have their own horizonal framework or schema, and Dasein's temporality is the inter-locking unity of these three schemata, creating the "*original horizonal schema*" that makes any and all understanding of being possible (GA24:436/307).

What distinguishes Dasein's existence from that of other entities, then, is that it is constituted by temporality, and the ecstatic unity of this temporalizing framework opens up a disclosive horizon on the basis of which entities (e.g., equipment, animals, cultural practices, institutions, and others) can be understood and reveal themselves *as such*, as the very entities that they are. This is why Heidegger says, "The ecstatical unity of temporality ... is the condition for the possibility that there can be an entity which exists as its 'there'" (SZ 350). But Heidegger makes a further distinction between authentic and inauthentic temporalizing. Inauthentic temporalizing is characterized by "falling" (*Verfallen*), a reference to the ways in which Dasein invariably gets caught up and distracted in the ecstasis of "the present" (*Gegenwart*), in the curiosity, gossip, and novelty of the public world. Distracted in this way, Dasein conforms to "the ANYONE" (*das Man*) and loses sight of its own temporal constitution as a finite, thrown project. As a result, its orientation in the future and the past is geared primarily toward immediate workaday concerns and petty commitments. Dispersed in "EVERYDAYNESS" (*Alltäglichkeit*), Dasein fails to see its authentic future and its authentic past. This is why moods like ANXIETY are so important for Heidegger, because they have the power to shatter the routinized famil-iarity of everydayness and expose us to the uncanny precariousness of our own existence,

namely, that we have been thrown into a contingent historical situation that we did not choose. And it is against the backdrop of this situation that we ceaselessly run ahead of ourselves into future possibilities and toward what Heidegger calls our "greatest ownmost possibility," death. Authentic Dasein anticipates this possibility with "resoluteness" (*Entschlossenheit*) in the sense of being steady and clear-sighted about where it comes from (past) and where it is heading (future), and this recognition opens up the ecstasis of the authentic present, one that Heidegger, following Kierkegaard, calls "the MOMENT of vision" (*Augenblick*, SZ 328). In these moments, Dasein is pulled out of the shallows of "the anyone" by owning up to and accepting its authentic temporal constitution as a thrown being-toward-death and is able to make decisions and take action in the future on the basis of this acceptance.

Kevin Aho

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 132n.; GA9:189–93/145–48, 196–201/150–53, 265/203, 324–62/247–75 *passim*; GA15:384/FS 71; GA49:53, 60; GA67:66

EMBODIMENT (*LEIB*). SEE LIVED BODY.

67.
EMERGENCE (*AUFGANG*)

E MERGENCE IS A particular style of becoming present – one in which the present entity is experienced as "self-unfolding" or "opening" up and manifesting itself in terms of the possibilities and characteristics it possesses inherently but holds back in self-concealment (see GA66:87). *Aufgang*, emergence, is Heidegger's translation of the Greek term *phusis*, more typically translated as "NATURE" (*Natur*; see GA9:259/198). But, Heidegger argues, *phusis* as used by early Greek philosophers "means something else, something more, than our word *nature*" (GA6.1:406/N2 188): it names "what is, as such as a whole" (GA40:18/17). Emergence[1] is thus Heidegger's name for the way BEING was experienced by the earliest Greek thinkers at the first INCEPTION of Western philosophy and, he argues, a certain understanding (or perhaps more accurately, a certain *mis*understanding) of being as emergence has continued to influence the development of Western philosophy ever since. But the original Greek *experience* of emergence was covered over by subsequent developments in thought, even though the conceptual repertoire inspired by emergence was retained.

One aspect of emergence – "self-unfolding presencing" – is experienced wherever something shows up as spontaneously manifesting itself as it was already in itself. A paradigm for emergence is the way seeds sprout, grow, mature into a plant, and decay. Emergence involves an *activity* or *process* of growth (GA4:56/79) – that is, an arising, lingering, and then decaying that discloses the growing thing's inner nature. Where being is understood as emergence, to be is to "appear in such a way that its appearance is determined on the basis of emerging-from-out-of-itself" (GA54:206). Emergence contrasts with, for instance, an understanding of being that takes as its paradigm manufactured or produced entities – that is, entities which manifest less their own nature or inherent aims and goals, and instead show up in terms of the intentions and designs of their creators or producers.

But emergence also involves a "dimensional character" – it "is in itself self-opening and self-closing" (GA55:299). That is, it opens itself up in one dimension by holding itself back or occluding aspects of itself in another dimension. Emergence is thus also distinct from the modern understanding of OCCURRENT objects with present properties. Occurrent objects can, of course, change. But priority is given to the occurrent properties they possess – the change is a law-governed unfolding of the causal consequences of those occurrent properties. An experience of emergence by contrast sees the occurrent properties as a present and contingent and partial manifestation of a "dimensionally" extended character that is never fully given, always self-concealing or occluding. (For more on the contrast between emergence, causality through another, and occurrent objectivity, see GA65:171.)

Emergence is the style that characterizes the first of the three main periods of Heidegger's "deepest history" of beyng (see HISTORY OF BEING; the other periods are the present age of MACHINATION, and the future, anticipated age of ADAPTATION; see GA69:27). "In the

---

[1] Other translations render *Aufgang* as "rising," "upsurgence," or "whooshing up."

beginning of Western history and as its beginning," Heidegger argues, "ʙᴇʏɴɢ is emergence (*phusis*), the emerging prevailing (the self-clearing presencing)" (GA66:95). For early Greek thinkers, Heidegger argues, the being of entities manifested itself primarily as emergence (see e.g., GA7:277ff./EGT 113 for a discussion of Heraclitus' insight into being as emergence). But the experience of being as emergence, Heidegger argues, is almost immediately misconstrued and lost: "original beyng leaves dominion up to the entities that for the first time move themselves into appearance in being as emergence. Ever since then the priority of entities, which set goals and measures for the determination of being, results in disposing of the emergence" (GA66:194). Elsewhere, he refers to the "overshadowing of being by the entity" (GA6.1:593/N3 157; GA85:93; GA66:391) or argues that "the entity, simultaneously known and forgotten, has overgrown being, and now strives against being" (GA66:96). Although the self-withdrawing or self-concealing dimension of emergence is experienced by early Greek philosophers, when being is conceptualized, the interpretation of that experience focuses on the present ᴀᴘᴘᴇᴀʀᴀɴᴄᴇ.

Paradoxically, the misunderstanding of emergence is a result of emergence itself – a result of the fact that entities show up as unfolding their own innermost nature:

> *phusis* is a developing and an emerging, a self-opening, which, while emerging, at the same time disappears into what has emerged, and so shrouds within itself that which on each occasion gives presence to what is presencing. Thought as a fundamental word, *phusis* signifies the emergence into the open.... *Phusis* is the emerging disappearing-into-itself and names the coming to presence of that which lingers in the emergence that essences in this way as the open. (GA4:56/79)

The process of emerging, in other words, disappears, withdrawing in favor of the entity that stands forth on the basis of emergence. This creates the illusion that what is can be grasped by looking at the occurrent properties of the entities that have emerged without regard for the process of emergence itself. Aristotle's concept of *energeia*, Heidegger argues, is an attempt "to preserve the last glimmer of the essence of *phusis*" (GA66:195) by pointing to the activity involved in disclosing entities. But the action, the *ergon*, "is explained by looking back at that which itself is something occurrent" (GA66:195).

Heidegger suggests that overcoming the technological age will involve reawakening a sense for emergence. See GA7:34–35/QCT 33–34 on the emergence of the saving power.

<div align="right">*Mark A. Wrathall*</div>

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA4:177ff./201ff.; GA8:143/236–37; GA9:259–60/197–99, 292–93/223–24; GA48:292; GA54:111, 137, 150, 153, 158, 175–76, 183, 197, 206; GA55:25, 298–99; GA65:171; GA66:87, 95–96, 193–95, 379, 391; GA69:27; GA70:66, 105; GA75:141, 157; GA85:93; GA40:18/17

FURTHER READING

Dreyfus and Kelly 2011

68.
EMERGENCY (*NOT*)

AN EMERGENCY IS a condition of needfulness that arises at a particular juncture and creates a pressing need or distress.

The German word *Not*, translated here as "emergency," lacks a perfect English equivalent. It is frequently used to denote necessity, compulsion, trouble, poverty, want, or hardship. But it often signifies distress or emergency. For example, a *Notausgang* is an emergency exit, an exit that is to be used in cases of urgent need. *Not* could also be translated as "needfulness," but the kind of need that interests Heidegger should not be confused with "needs" (*Bedürfnisse*) that stem from urges, wishes, and cravings (GA51:4–5). For Heidegger, human salvation depends on experiencing and recognizing a certain kind of profound emergency. The emergency of being determines what is "necessary" for human beings, what they need to do in order to live up to their destiny as DASEIN.

In the 1920s, without especially using the word "emergency," Heidegger develops the view that it is at times of crisis that the greatest insights may become possible. Such a time is a *kairos*, a unique turning point and MOMENT of decision when the whole world can become transfigured. For example, the significance of our BEING-IN-THE-WORLD as a whole comes into view most clearly when it is threatened in ANXIETY (SZ 184–91). An anxious confrontation with the ultimate darkness of "nihilation" can bring the SENSE of being to light (GA9:111–22/87–96).

In 1930, Heidegger extends this point of view from the extraordinary experiences of an individual to a collective condition. Attempting to identify the fundamental MOOD of his times, Heidegger ventures that it consists in "profound BOREDOM" (GA29/30:115). This underlying ennui or disengagement is not necessarily evident at first glance, yet it is the key in which we hear the tune of our whole existence. Heidegger's goal is to alert his audience to profound boredom so that it may become anything but boring. Instead, it may be experienced as an emergency, the emergency of the absence of distress (GA29/30:246). It may then be transformed in a moment of vision.

Perhaps not coincidentally, 1930 is also the year when, by his own account, Heidegger became politically radicalized and began to believe that National Socialism could represent a new "INCEPTION" for the West (GA95:408). Heidegger's Nazi engagement can be seen as an affirmation that the West is in crisis and that only a thorough upheaval can respond adequately to this emergency. The danger is that "the spiritual strength of the West [may] fail" and our "illusory culture [may] suffocate in madness" (GA16:117/HR 116). In lectures from 1934–35, Heidegger speaks of this "threat to our spiritual and historical Dasein" as the "innermost and broadest emergency" (GA39:113) that faces the people at a time when "the West [is] hovering at the edge of the abyss" (GA39:222). The "highest emergency" faces us in the form of a decision as to whether the people will find its gods (GA39:146) – that is, whether the dimension of the holy will open up for the community, if only as a question, or whether that dimension will be completely occluded.

In the *Contributions to Philosophy* of 1936–38, the political dimension of Heidegger's thought has become more muted and skeptical, but the theme of emergency is taken to new heights. Heidegger repeatedly reflects on "the emergency of the lack of emergency" (*die Not der Notlosigkeit*; GA65:11, 107, 234–37). This reflection can be seen as an extension of his thoughts on profound boredom in 1930. In some notes for a 1937–38 seminar, Heidegger describes the emergency of the lack of emergency as a state in which "everything is familiar and accessible and answered – and everything can be managed and handled." The experience of this condition "must stem from emergency and remain in its lineage, so much so that it first necessitates [*ernötigt*] the emergency" (GA88:40). In a time when (Heidegger claims) nothing is perceived as urgent or compelling, the lack of urgency must itself come to be perceived as an emergency.

The lack of emergency is due to the ABANDONMENT OF BEING (*Seinsverlassenheit*): that is, not simply our neglect of being, but being's self-concealment or turning away from us (GA65:119; GA66:358). Such abandonment is evident in the metaphysical tradition, for which being is no longer an urgent question. In the 1940s Heidegger identifies this absence of questioning as the core of NIHILISM, which simultaneously threatens both the human essence and being itself (GA67:250): being risks losing all meaning, and humans risk losing their status as Dasein, that is, the entity for whom being is an issue. The only way out of nihilism is to experience the lack of emergency as itself an emergency that pertains to being (GA67:251). In order to allow ourselves this experience, we must overcome "anxiety in the face of anxiety" (GA67:252) and allow ourselves to face the terror of nihilation.

A further recurrent thought is that every necessity (*Notwendigkeit*) is rooted in an emergency (*Not*), or is disclosed in it (GA65:45, 97). One would traditionally assume that necessity is established by universal physical, metaphysical, or logical principles, and is thus prior to any particular experience of emergency to which an individual or a group might be exposed. Heidegger's deliberate reversal of this priority, which is part of his rethinking of the "modalities" (GA65:279–83), reflects his view that all logic, physics, and metaphysics are themselves historical; they are manifestations of a "HISTORY OF BEING" in which disclosures of the world are given to human beings. If this is so, then emergency is the more fundamental issue: only because historical emergencies essentially challenge us to receive and wrestle with meanings of being are we able to grasp any necessary aspects of entities, or necessary relations among the assertions we make about entities.

We can thus even say that emergency is the truth of being itself (GA65:46). In other words, when our identity is put into question and we are jolted into asking who we are, we can appreciate the difference it makes that there is something instead of nothing. We can explicitly ask what it means to be, wrestle with the traditional sense of being, and struggle toward a creative new confrontation with being. When emergency dies down, this project ceases to be urgent and being fades into the background. Our fateful confrontation with the question of who we are is "necessary" (*nötig*) in the human sense; that is, it is an urgent need or fate that emerges from an emergency (GA36/37:78). Such an emergency makes it urgent (*ernötigt*) to ground Dasein in its highest possibilities (GA65:46; GA66:235; GA76:100).

These possibilities include philosophy (GA65:45), and specifically the confrontation with the philosophical tradition (GA66:80). We need to experience the emergency of our times in terms of the looming collapse of "the first inception" (the contemplation of the being of entities that was inaugurated by the early Greek thinkers) and the possible dawning of "the other inception"

(a new kind of thinking that would ask how being itself essentially happens, e.g., GA65:5–6, 171). The transition from the first to the other inception is a *krisis* in the root sense, a historical decision that thrusts us into the deepest emergency and need. Transitional thinking may require rereading the thinkers of the first inception in a way that anticipates the other inception, as when Heidegger translates Anaximander's *to chreon* – usually taken as physical or metaphysical necessity – as *nötigende Not*, "emergency that necessitates" (GA51:106).

With the development of the concept of RELEASEMENT (*Gelassenheit*) in the 1940s, which sets aside willful choice, and after the defeat of Germany in the Second World War, Heidegger's writings convey less of a sense of acute crisis, and instead aspire to be set free from urgent requirements. In a lecture from 1945, he defines needfulness (*Not*) as being forced to satisfy the needs of survival, and says that true "necessity" (*Not-wendigkeit*, or "need-turning") is found only in freedom, which turns away from or overturns neediness (Heidegger 1994a, 8).

However, one can make the case that Heidegger's thought is still focused on emergency, even if he no longer favors the word. He persistently warns of the "danger" of losing an adequate relation to being, particularly in the age dominated by TECHNOLOGY, when all entities are experienced as exploitable resources. Heidegger's claim, following Hölderlin, is that within the DANGER itself, the saving element may grow (GA79:72). Thus, the key is to experience the general emergency of our age as harboring a destiny that is "sent" by being itself or by ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*). The "abandonment of being" or "oblivion of being" can itself be perceived as a gift. The emergency itself thus points to our salvation. However, no human attitude, thought, or action can carry out this salvation. Ultimately, "only a god can save us" (GA16:671/HR 326).

Richard Polt

FURTHER READING

Dreyfus 1997, Haar 1983, Polt 2006

ENACTMENT (*VOLLZUG*). SEE ACTUALIZATION.

69.
ENCHANTMENT (*ZAUBER*)

Enchantment is what challenges and even escapes our capacity for rational comprehension. In *Being and Time*, for example, Heidegger mentions the enchanting powers of the rituals of "primitive" cultures (SZ 81). There is no precise definition of enchantment in Heidegger's texts, and the term never becomes part of his technical vocabulary. In its ordinary use, enchantment is usually associated with magic and MYTH, as opposed to rational and scientific thought. As Heidegger becomes increasingly preoccupied with the question of modernity around the middle of the 1930s, he begins to speak about enchantment in a philosophically more pregnant sense.

Enchantment bears the double meaning of captivation or charm on the one hand, and bewitchment or illusion on the other. To be enchanted (*bezaubert*) by the world is to wonder at it, to feel delight in the face of its overwhelming and enigmatic presence. Heidegger therefore at times speaks about enchantment in relation to POETRY, as when he says that the poet is enchanted by wonder (GA12:161/OWL 67), and also that we are enchanted by poetry, because it tells of the "veiled experiences" of the poet (GA12:209/OWL 141). The feeling of enchantment should therefore be contrasted with the scientific quest for intelligibility. In contrast to the sober scientist, the enchanted poet does not so much try to explain the world as rather to give voice to its intrinsic MYSTERY.

It has become something of a commonplace that the world of ancient times was enchanted in this sense: before man had conquered nature with SCIENCE and TECHNOLOGY he experienced it as a totality invested with ineffable meaning and beauty. But to be enchanted can also mean to be under a spell so as to be deceived. From the point of view of modern science, the medieval man was indeed deceived in his enchantment, because he was wrong to invest nature with a purposeful design. Accordingly, modern science is often said to involve a disenchantment (*Entzauberung*) of the world. This expression was originally introduced into the scientific debate by Max Weber, to whom Heidegger also refers at one point (GA28:349). In Heidegger's view, however, we are mistaken if we believe that the modern disenchantment of nature means the triumph of reason over myth. In fact, modern science is itself founded on a particular kind of re-enchantment of the world:

> to be sure, since Copernicus, the setting of the sun is just a deception of the eye. Modern science knows better about such things. Sunsets are only for "poets" and "lovers." The enchantment of the world has been replaced by another enchantment. What is enchanting is now "physics" itself, namely as man's highest achievement. Man now enchants himself through himself. Modern man is now the enchanter. (GA55:50)

The point here is that the extent to which modern man has faith in science, as the expression of his own immense capacity to make the world intelligible, goes beyond what can be rationally justified. His trust in the omnipotence of science is in this respect no less "irrational" than, say, a belief in the healing powers of cult and magic. When Heidegger wants to get at this aspect of enchantment, he usually speaks about "bewitchment" (*Verzauberung*) rather than enchantment (*Zauberung*). Whereas enchantment first of all signifies the enchanting appearance of the world, bewitchment refers to this event as a condition of man. In *Beiträge*, Heidegger accordingly claims

that the disenchantment of the world "makes room for the power of a bewitchment [*Verzauberung*] that is enacted by the disenchanting itself" (GA65:107). Modern science and technology bewitch us to such an extent that we become blind to this very event itself. We are no longer enchanted by the world in the sense of being captivated by its inscrutability, because we feel assured that everything is on principle intelligible to us. But this disenchanted attitude toward the world is precisely the enchantment of our time, in the sense of our great illusion.

At bottom, the nature of reality is, as Heidegger sees it, opaque. We cannot explain why the world appears to us in this way rather than in another, in the sense of revealing the ultimate basis for this, because there simply is no such basis. Moreover, prior to every rationalization of the world, the latter has always addressed us in a certain way. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger tried to capture our pre-rational commitment to the world in terms of MOOD or attunement (*Stimmung*). The concept of enchantment is assigned a similar role. Occasionally, Heidegger describes the enchantment of the world as a kind of force, something that pulls us toward itself (GA52:134). That this is intended as an illustration of how the world becomes opened up to us in the first place, becomes particularly clear in *Discourse on Thinking*. Here the discussants reflect on the notion of horizon, understood as the delimited field of vision belonging to our perception of the world. This is reinterpreted in terms of an open space, where entities appear to us. When asked about the nature of this openness itself, the "teacher" answers that it strikes him as "an enchanted region where everything belonging there returns to that in which it rests" (GA13:45/DT 65). And the "scientist" adds that "the enchantment of this region" might be "the prevailing of its essence" (GA13:46/DT 65). The concept of enchantment here becomes part of an attempt to think the conditions of possibility for the appearance of the world in less rationalistic and subjectivist terms than what we moderns are used to do.

In sum, then, Heidegger speaks about enchantment in a positive as well as in a negative sense. It can refer to our openness to the mystery of the world, but it can also stand for our naive, at bottom irrational, belief in the powers of modern technology and science to take full control of reality, both theoretically and practically.

Charlotta Weigelt

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Enchantment (*Zauber*) GA6.1:525, 566/N3 95, 132; GA12:99/OWL 16 ("das Bezaubernde"); GA13:45–46/DT 65; GA55:50, 95, 342; GA65:343; GA66:29; GA69:193; GA77:112–13; GA79:161

Enchantment and myth SZ 81, 247; GA27:359–60, 364, 384

Enchantment and poetry GA12:161, 209/OWL 67, 141; GA13:117, 134, 137–38, 168, 174; GA52:26; GA53:165

Enchantment (*Verzauberung*) GA6.1:566/N3 132; GA65:107, 109, 124, 130; GA69:39, 193, 201, 204; GA79:161

Disenchantment GA13:212; GA24:404 (in a positive sense); GA28:349; GA65:107, 124; GA90:248

FURTHER READING

Gordon 2005, Guzzoni 2009, Lüders 2001, Michel 1997

ENCOUNTER (*AUSEINANDERSETZUNG*). SEE CONFRONTATION.

70.
END (*ENDE*)

"End" CAN REFER to an outermost limit, to the cessation of a process, or to the termination or the guiding purpose of an entity. Heidegger distinguishes the existential ending of DASEIN'S BEING-IN-THE-WORLD from the occurrent ending of something such as a rain shower, a road, a painting, or a loaf of bread (SZ 244–45). Dasein's end is somehow ontologically intrinsic to it, rather than being some extrinsic point at which it gets cut off, finished, or used up. To have an end in this EXISTENTIAL sense is to have a way of being Heidegger calls "being toward the end" (*Sein zum Ende*, SZ 245). To be toward the end in this manner is to exist "for the sake of" certain projects and defining commitments which remain "always outstanding," guiding my activities, structuring my world, and giving me an identity rather than being definite goals I seek to accomplish and leave behind. To adopt an example from Blattner (1999), the distinction between being toward the end in the existential sense and being toward an end in the occurrent sense is mirrored in the distinction between having the *identity* of being a teacher and having the *goal* of getting tenure.

Yet, Heidegger also claims that "the 'end' of being-in-the-world is DEATH" (SZ 234). There is an intimate connection, then, between existing for the sake of certain defining commitments (being toward the end) and having a way of being that is existentially inflected by my impending death (being toward death). According to Heidegger, to be a finite (in German *endliche*; the etymological connection to *Ende* should not be overlooked) entity is to project myself for-the-sake-of certain ends which matter because I am dying (on the way to my end). The ontological interpretation of Dasein's end thus leads Heidegger directly into his ontological interpretation of death.

The ontologically distinctive bearing Dasein has toward its end is a feature of what it means to have a way of being defined by CARE. To the extent that things matter to me, I am not concerned just to be finished with them; rather, I am constantly moved to undertake the activities called for by these commitments. This is what Heidegger means by saying Dasein is always "ahead of itself" and that there are always things it has "not yet" done (there is a "not yet" that constitutively belongs to its being).

Thus, the claim that Dasein is "being toward the end" is, in the end, a reformulation of the claims that Dasein's own being is continually "at stake" for it, that Dasein exists "for the sake of" its own being, and that Dasein is always "ahead of itself." In each case, the issue is how Dasein relates to itself in light of the way certain projects, people, commitments matter to it.

Heidegger raises the issue of Dasein's *end* in the context of the methodological discussion that begins *Being and Time*, Division II. There he poses the question of whether or not the *whole* of Dasein – "this entity from its 'beginning' to its 'end'" (SZ 233) – has been in view in Division I of the work. The EVERYDAYNESS under consideration in Division I is bound to generate an interpretation that "cannot lay claim to primordiality," Heidegger asserts. This is because, since everydayness transpires "'BETWEEN' birth and death" (SZ 233), it does not provide an orientation to the *whole* of Dasein's being (only its middle, so to speak).

The issue of wholeness makes the question concerning the end of Dasein bleed right into the question concerning Dasein's death, since, as we've seen, the end of Dasein's being-in-the-world is *death* (SZ 234). So, in order to get an interpretation of the whole of Dasein's being, we need to include its ending and death (by extension, we would need to include birth, but Heidegger does not explicitly provide an existential interpretation of beginning and birth).

The framing of the "wholeness" requirement in terms of ending and death flirts with a methodological aporia:

> Any entity whose ESSENCE is made of EXISTENCE, is essentially opposed to the possibility of our getting it in our grasp as an entity which is a whole. . . . One may even question whether 'having' the whole entity is attainable at all, and whether a primordial ontological Interpretation of Dasein will not founder on the kind of being which belongs to the very entity we have taken as our theme. (SZ 233)

This seeming aporia, though, emerges because the concepts of "wholeness" and "ending" require "existential" interpretations. If you use "OCCURRENT" interpretations of "wholeness" and "ending," then the whole of Dasein becomes available for interpretation only when it has come to its end in death, right when it is no-longer-there, and in that case the object of your interpretation will become whole when it has ceased to be. Heidegger dissolves this aporia by distinguishing between the kind of end that is ontologically appropriate to Dasein and the kind of end that pertains to non-Dasein, occurrent [*vorhandene*] things such as rain showers, roads, paintings, and loaves of bread (SZ 244–45).

In the occurrent sense an ending is either a stopping (as with a road), getting finished (as with a painting), getting all used up (as with the bread), disappearing (as with the rain shower). But these are all ways of "being-at-the-end" (*Sein-zu-Ende*, SZ 234), not "being-toward-the-end." Being-at-the-end is not "ontologically appropriate" to Dasein's way of being, which is "ahead of itself" and with something "always outstanding" insofar as Dasein has an identity that is defined by fragile commitments that ongoingly matter to and orient it (that is, insofar as Dasein is a finite, dying entity).

Being-toward-the-end, Dasein's being-toward-death, is "formally analogous to" the teleological relation a ripening fruit has to its future ripeness (SZ 244). Here we have to do with an intrinsic bearing toward an end. The analogy only goes so far. Whereas ripeness is a kind of "fulfillment" of the being of the fruit, the end of Dasein in death is no such fulfillment, Heidegger maintains. On the one hand, Dasein may reach its ripeness well before its ending in death and, on the other hand, even "'unfulfilled' Dasein ends" (SZ 244).

In any case, the phenomenon of ripening points in a direction – it gives a clue for understanding a way of being to which a "not yet" belongs, which is to say a way of being-toward-the-end. With the distinction between occurrently being-at-the-end and existentially being-toward-the-end, Heidegger has avoided the methodological aporia mentioned above. The puzzle arises only if you see Dasein's wholeness as a matter of its being-at-the-end (what Heidegger goes on to define as "demise," in distinction from death). With this shift, the methodological requirement to get Dasein's *whole* being into view shifts from calling for an interpretation of the *end* of Dasein to calling for an explicit existential interpretation of the *death* of Dasein.

B. Scot Rousse

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 233–38, 241–46, 259, 264, 305, 373, 424, 426; GA18:81–86, 88–91; GA20:425, 429–30

ENJOIN (*FUGEN*). SEE FITTING.

ENOWNING (*EREIGNIS*). SEE ADAPTATION.

ENTANGLEMENT (*VERFALL*). SEE FALLING.

ENVIRONING WORLD (*UMWELT*). SEE WORLD.

ENVIRONMENT (*UMWELT*). SEE WORLD.

71.
EPOCHÉ

T HE EPOCHÉ IS BEING holding itself back, thus allowing an "epoch" or period in the HISTORY OF BEING to prevail for a while. "Epoché" originally referred to the method that the ancient Greek Skeptics employed of suspending judgment on unresolvable issues – which meant virtually all issues – in order to achieve mental peace, *ataraxia*. Husserl adapted this method for the initiating act of PHENOMENOLOGY which suspends the natural attitude's pervasive belief in the independent reality of the external world. This "reduces" reality to our experiences (*noema*) and reveals the covert participation of transcendental consciousness (*noeses*) in what had naively looked like wholly independent things.

Like the other existential phenomenologists, Heidegger is wary of this idea. Indeed, *Being and Time*'s definition of DASEIN as BEING-IN-THE-WORLD can be seen as a direct repudiation of the epoché's trapdoor opening into transcendental consciousness's "sphere of ownness," repeating a Kierkegaardian-Nietzschean critique of an inclination to escape the WORLD that is endemic to philosophy in general.

Heidegger also objects to Husserl's framing of the issue in terms of beliefs. There are two arguments here. First, phenomenologically, we find no such apparatus in our "natural" average everyday going about our business.

> Nothing exists in our relationship to the world which provides a basis for the phenomenon of belief in the world. I have not yet been able to find this phenomenon of belief. Rather, the peculiar thing is just that the world is "there" *before* all belief. The world is never experienced as something which is believed any more than it is guaranteed by knowledge. . . . Any purported belief in it is a theoretically motivated misunderstanding. (GA20:295)

Demanding that a cognitive scaffolding must be supporting all our actions is an unmotivated assumption based on the presupposed model of theoretical knowledge. Husserlian phenomenology's attempt to escape presuppositions is itself informed by one, and a highly dubious one at that.

Second, if we perform an epoché and disengage from our everyday interactions with the world, "being-in-the-world is now *modified* to a state of solely *looking*" (GA20:266, first italics added). The technique is supposed to merely reveal what has been there all along beneath notice, but Heidegger argues that changing our stance alters the way we are and the way the world presents itself to us. Disengagement makes our absorbed dealings with the world look like they rest on an epistemic foundation of knowledge which can then be evaluated for validity. Voilá Descartes!

But this gets things backwards. Heidegger believes that all cognitive machinery actually rests on a non-cognitive UNDERSTANDING (*Verstehen*) that is more like a mastery or know-how than conscious beliefs or knowing-that. "The kind of dealing which is closest to us is as we have shown, not a bare perceptual cognition, but rather that kind of concern which manipulates

things and puts them to use; and this has its own kind of 'knowledge.'"[1] The notion to suspend these "beliefs" is only plausible after our usually active being-in-the-world has been suspended, thus transforming our way of being from absorbed actor to disengaged thinker, and the way of being of the things we are examining from AVAILABLE to OCCURRENT. Once again, Husserl is hoist by his own phenomenological petard: his method for getting to the things themselves actually changes them, forgetting the ubiquitous but inconspicuous modes.

However, there is something in the early work that functions somewhat like the epoché. Husserl's disciple Eugen Fink famously objected that there can be no natural motivation to perform the reduction given how drastically it departs from the natural attitude we live out our lives in. Heidegger neatly solves this problem by locating an organic impetus for the switch in conditions of extreme depression ("ANXIETY") or, in *Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, BOREDOM. These moods eject us from the usually unthinking going-with-the-flow of our lives, changing experience from inertial to inert. Suddenly, we cannot get into our normal activities; they lie slack at our feet, drained of color and meaning. Anticipating DEATH also cuts us off from our projects, allowing us to see the choices we have made and to see them *as* our choices, which we may decide to revise. Whereas Husserl's epoché reveals our cognitive involvement in experience, Heidegger's anxiety and anticipation uncover our existential participation in life, allowing us to overcome the inauthentic, passive inertia of living as "one" does.

Heidegger's later works view being almost entirely in light of its history, in which being has manifested itself very differently in various periods which he calls "epochs": "the giving in 'It gives being' proved to be a sending and a DESTINY of presence in its epochal transmutations" (GA14:22/OTB 17). This term invokes earlier notions while fundamentally changing them. He now locates the suspension occurring within being instead of us: by concealing itself, being holds itself back as it unconceals or releases entities into our clearing.

> The history of being means destiny of being in whose sendings both the sending and the It which sends forth hold back with their self-manifestation. To hold back is, in Greek, *epoche*. Hence we speak of the epochs of the destiny of being. Epoch does not mean here a span of time in occurrence, but rather the fundamental characteristic of sending, the actual holding-back of itself in favor of the discernibility of the gift, that is, of being with regard to the grounding of entities. (GA14:13/OTB 9)

This slightly overstates the case since these sendings do govern cultures for periods of time. The word "epoch" felicitously invokes both meanings: "the epoche of being belongs to being itself.... From the *epoche* of being comes the epochal essence of its destining" (GA5:337–38/EGT 26–27). Heidegger's history of being does not evaluate the correctness of the various systems of metaphysics but, in a sense, "brackets" them to turn toward their source: "thinking then stands in and before That which has sent the various forms of epochal being" (GA14:50/OTB 41).

Lee Braver

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 59–62, 184–91, 249–67; GA20:251–69, 292–306; *Early Greek Thinking*; *On Time and Being*

---

[1] SZ 67; see also SZ 143. Hubert Dreyfus has studied this alternative mode at length, bringing it to bear on the issue of AI. See Dreyfus 1991 and Dreyfus 1992; see also Braver 2012, esp. chap. 4.

72.
EQUIPMENT (*ZEUG*)

E QUIPMENT COMPRISES ENTITIES that offer themselves to us to be used in the service of
purposive action. "Equipment" is Heidegger's term for the entities that we encounter in
immediate, everyday COPING. Thus equipment plays an important role in *Being and Time*'s
PHENOMENOLOGY of the everyday. The German word translated here as "equipment" – *das
Zeug* – means "stuff" in colloquial use. In other contexts, it can be translated as "instrument" or
"tool." Heidegger uses it primarily as a collective noun to refer to entities we employ in our
everyday activities, thereby rendering such translations somewhat unwieldy. With this in mind,
"*das Zeug*" is typically translated as "equipment," although Stambaugh opts for "useful thing."

In *Being and Time*, the term first occurs in Heidegger's designation of the starting point, for
his phenomenological pursuit of the BEING of entities, as "those entities which we encounter as
closest to us" (SZ 66). The purpose of this methodological prioritization of immediately
encountered entities is to articulate the ontological structure, the being, of such entities. And,
according to Heidegger, the entities thus encountered are *equipment*, or "AVAILABLE" entities.
His analysis, then, is intended to explicate that which determines the equipmental entity as
such – "its equipmentality" (SZ 68), its "availableness" (SZ 69).

Heidegger begins his analysis of equipmentality by noting that "Taken strictly, there 'is' no
such thing as *an* equipment," since "Equipment – in accordance with its equipmentality – always
is *in terms of* its belonging to other equipment" (SZ 68). That is, by virtue of their very way of
being, equipmental entities cannot exist in isolation, but are necessarily in relation to other
available entities. This structural characteristic of availableness, Heidegger names "*assignment*
or *reference*" (SZ 68; see REFERENCE). Equipmental entities are thus assigned or referred insofar
as they are things "in-order-to" (SZ 68); they are *for* something, and so are referred beyond
themselves.

Heidegger introduces the referential aspect of the available's structure with the following
example of a group of mutually referred equipmental entities: "ink-stand, pen, ink, paper,
blotting pad, table, lamps, furniture, windows, doors, room" (SZ 68). As equipmental, any
particular entity in this group is the useful thing that it is through its being related to other
useful things. For instance, the pen, as a thing with which to write, can only play this role, and
thus be what it is, insofar as it exists along with other pieces of equipment. For without ink and
paper, the pen cannot be used for writing. Therefore, it cannot exist, as such, in isolation from
other equipment, but only "in terms of its belonging to other equipment." It is in this sense that
there can be "no such thing as *an* equipment." By the same token, the other available entities
among which the pen belongs cannot themselves exist in isolation from other equipment. For
instance, the paper, as something on which to write, can only play this role, and thus be what it
is, insofar as it exists along with pen and ink. Therefore, available entities, in being entities that
are essentially *for* something, necessarily refer to each other.

Heidegger's example of mutually referred useful things also indicates that the available belongs
not only to other equipment, but that "To the being of any equipment there always belongs an

equipmental whole [*ein Zeugganzes*]" (SZ 68). The available's relation to an equipmental whole is indicated by the example's inclusion of the room in which the equipment exists. As that in which a group of available entities exists, the room is not just another piece of equipment. Still, it is not an intrinsically featureless geometrical space, but it has an equipmental meaning. In Heidegger's words, "we encounter [the room] not as something 'between four walls' in a geometrical spatial sense, but as equipment for residing" (SZ 68). Specifically, the room is the context, the inter-related set of equipmental references (SZ 69), in terms of which the various available entities within the room possess their equipmental identities. As Heidegger puts it, "A totality of equipment is constituted by various ways of the 'in-order-to'" (SZ 68). Since it is an equipmental being's position in this whole that determines it as such, the context makes the entities that exist within it possible. In this sense, the room is not reducible to the sum of several essentially isolated, independently existing objects – "a sum of *realia*" (SZ 68) – from whose occurrence and specific arrangement the existence of the room would be derived. Instead, as referred to each other, and thus to the overall context of such equipmental references, all available entities are dependent upon the equipmental whole within which they are found. Moreover, the room is situated within a wider context, i.e., the home in which more mutually referred equipmental entities exist, and within and in terms of which the room plays its equipmental role. And the home, in turn, is itself situated within a still wider context, populated by still more equipment, etc. Ultimately, the various, increasingly comprehensive equipmental contexts, along with the equipment that they make possible, are situated within, and thus made possible by, the all-encompassing equipmental whole. This overarching set of references wherein all available entities have their defining equipmental roles is what Heidegger calls "world" (SZ 75).

Insofar as the world makes available entities possible, this total equipmental context maintains an ontological primacy over the available. This primacy is "exhibited phenomenolo-gically" (SZ 66) in a corresponding experiential primacy, which Heidegger discusses in his analysis of our immediate, everyday manner of encountering equipment. Returning to Heidegger's example of the room of available entities, he points out that our primary way of encountering such entities is not as individual pieces of equipment that we mentally add together as we serially experience them, thereby yielding an experience of the room as the totality of the individual things within it. Instead, "What we encounter as closest to us . . . is the room" (SZ 68). That is, our immediate experience is primarily of the room as equipmental context, while the experience of individual pieces of equipment requires a secondary act of abstraction. And this immediate encounter with the room as equipmental context, Heidegger maintains, is not an explicit, thematic grasp, but an implicit recognition thereof. Furthermore, since the room can only play this equipmental role insofar as it is situated within a wider context, which is itself situated within a still wider context, culminating in their all being situated within the all-encompassing world-context; our everyday encounter with the available presupposes a more fundamental, though non-thematic, encounter with the ultimate equipmental whole – in Heidegger's terms, "understanding the world" (SZ 86).

The referential structure of the available is exhibited not only in the useful thing's constitu-tive relations to other equipment and to the equipmental totality that makes them possible, but also in the equipmental entity's reference to a project for which it is useful. Heidegger illustrates this with the example of a hammer (see SZ 84). The hammer is the useful thing that it is, i.e., a thing for hammering nails, insofar as the hammering is for a project, such as fastening a board. In this sense, the hammer is referred not only to other equipmental entities, in this case, nails,

boards, etc., but also to the project of, here, board-fastening. The fastening, in turn, is for the more fundamental project of protection from bad weather, to which the hammer, then, is further referred. Ultimately, any equipmental entity is referred to the most fundamental project, which is the existence of the user of the available – the EXISTENCE of Dasein. In the case of the hammer, the project of protection from bad weather is protection *for Dasein*. And insofar as Dasein plays this role of all-encompassing project, Heidegger characterizes it as the ultimate "FOR-THE-SAKE-OF-WHICH" (SZ 84).

As the ultimate, all-encompassing project to which all available entities are referred, Dasein itself makes equipment possible, giving Dasein an ontological primacy over the available, thereby manifesting a fundamental similarity between the world and Dasein. And, as in the case of the world's ontological primacy, Dasein's ontological primacy is exhibited in a corresponding experiential primacy. This experiential primacy of Dasein as for-the-sake-of-which is rooted in the referential structure of equipmental entities, as this structure gives the available a characteristic transparency. In Heidegger's words, the available being "must, as it were, withdraw in order to be available quite authentically" (SZ 69). That is, our encounter with equipment is not an explicit cognitive grasp of a piece of equipment, but is one in which we are engaged with, or "cope with" (SZ 69) the available by using and manipulating it. When engaged in such COPING, our focus is not on the particular available entity in use, but is directed at the project to which the useful thing is referred (see SZ 69–70). Thus, when hammering a nail, in order to fasten a board, in order to protect oneself from bad weather, Dasein's immediate, primary focus is not on the hammer, the nail, or the board, but on the project of protection. More specifically, its focus is on the project of protecting itself. Herein lies the transparency of the available: the user's grasp of the thing in use sees through the equipmental entity, so to speak, looking toward Dasein itself as the purpose of its engagement with the useful. Hence, the experiential primacy of the user over the useful. That is, Dasein's encounter with equipmental entities presupposes a more fundamental encounter with itself (see SZ 86). And, as in the case of the experiential primacy of the world-context, that of Dasein is not an explicit, thematic grasp, but an implicit recognition thereof.

With the foregrounding of equipment, as the phenomenological starting point of his pursuit of the being of entities, Heidegger begins to contrast his own ontology with the traditional Western philosophical interpretation of being – the ontology of the OCCURRENT. For this tradition arrives at its conception of being by analyzing the basic structural characteristics of entities encountered not in the engaged use and manipulation thereof, but in a mode of encounter in which one simply observes things. Taking the object of such an encounter, i.e., the occurrent entity, as its starting point, Western philosophers have mistakenly conceived being as occurrentness. Heidegger's prioritization of the available, rather than the occurrent, initiates his repudiation of the traditional ontology. Among the ways in which this prioritization leads to such a repudiation are the following.

Insofar as the equipmental references that determine the identity of the available entity ultimately terminate in a reference to the user of equipment, as the for-the-sake-of-which of equipmental coping; the fundamental structure of the available, in direct opposition to that of the occurrent, includes an essential relation to the subject that copes with the available. Therefore, Heidegger's conception of the being of entities will include a relation to subjectivity that cannot be accounted for by the ontology of the occurrent. Furthermore, since the comprehension of the equipmental totality that makes the equipmental entity possible is a non-thematic grasp, Heidegger argues that the being of entities in general, i.e., being itself, is only

comprehensible in a non-thematic type of cognition. In this way, Heidegger's analysis of equipment leads to his conception of being as fundamentally indeterminate.

Mark Tanzer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 68–76, 79–81, 99, 352–55; GA20:259; GA23:19–24; GA24:96, 151–53, 231–33, 414–18; GA25:21–23: GA26:233; GA 29/30:311–16, 319–25

FURTHER READING

Guignon 1983, Taylor 2006, Zimmerman 1990

73.

EQUIPRIMORDIALITY
(*GLEICHURSPRÜNGLICHKEIT*)

Two or more different phenomena are equiprimordial (equally original or co-original; *gleichursprünglich*) if they are mutually interdependent and can only be understood in relation to each other, and if in addition they are not based on a common, more fundamental, phenomenon. They belong to a common phenomenon and highlight different aspects of it, but are not reducible to it. Furthermore, there is no hierarchy between equiprimordial phenomena, no phenomenon is more basic than the other. Instead, they are equally basic. In particular, equiprimordial phenomena are not derivable from or based on each other.

Heidegger uses the term in his early writings and especially in *Being and Time*, where most of the examples of equiprimordial phenomena can be found. In his later works, the term appears only occasionally. Obviously, Heidegger developed the concept of equiprimordiality as a term referring to Husserl's phenomenological investigations, in which Husserl analyzes different aspects of one phenomenon. In his lectures on the *Phenomenology of Internal Time-Consciousness* (1905–10), for example, Husserl describes the complexity of the experience of time and shows that it has several aspects which cannot be reduced to each other. In particular, Husserl's concepts of *protention* and *retention* in this context mean that our grasping of phenomena in time, like understanding a phrase or listening to music, has to rely equally on past, present, and future. This corresponds quite directly to Heidegger's claim of the equiprimordiality of past, present, and future as aspects of temporality (SZ 338, 340, 365; cf. also GA24:377, 406, and GA42:197).

One of the first examples Heidegger gives is the equiprimordiality of being-with (*Miteinandersein*) and speaking (*Sprechendsein*) in his 1924 lecture course on Aristotle (GA18:62, 64). In the lecture on the concept of time in 1925 he claims that listening and speaking are equiprimordial with UNDERSTANDING (GA20:368), which resembles the equiprimordiality of listening and speaking in his Hölderlin lecture in 1934/35 (GA39:71). There, he also claims the equiprimordiality of conversation and silence (GA39:70). In the *Contributions to Philosophy* (1936–38), he maintains that LANGUAGE (*Sprache*) and the HUMAN BEING (*Mensch*) belong equiprimordially to BEYNG (*Seyn*, GA65:497).

In *Being and Time*, we find the most important examples of equiprimordiality, which are crucial to Heidegger's entire philosophical approach. First of all, he explains the concept of equiprimordiality, which is particularly directed against explanations of several phenomena from one single reason (*Urgrund*, SZ 131, cf. also GA20:332). Similar to the earlier claim of the equiprimordiality of being-with, speaking, listening, and understanding, he maintains the equiprimordiality of DISPOSEDNESS (*Befindlichkeit*), understanding (*Verstehen*), and DISCOURSE (*Rede*, SZ 133, 143, 161). This can be seen as an aspect of the more general claim of the equiprimordiality of disposedness with the DISCLOSEDNESS of the WORLD (*Erschlossenheit der Welt*), BEING-WITH (*Mit-sein*), and EXISTENCE (*Existenz*), which all belong to the phenomenon of BEING-IN-THE-WORLD (*In-der-Welt-sein*, SZ 137).

A predecessor of this assertion can be found in his lecture on the concept of time in 1925, where disposedness is maintained to be equiprimordial with being discovered (*Entdecktheit*) and disclosedness (GA20:354). In *Being and Time*, this idea is further spelled out as the equiprimordiality of world (*Welt*), being-in (*In-sein*) and self (*Selbst*) as aspects of being-in-the-world, which are equiprimordially disclosed (SZ 297, 350; cf. also SZ 200, 220, and GA20:350). The equiprimordiality of world and self can also be found in his 1927 lecture course on phenomenology, where Heidegger argues that the subject is equiprimordially constituted by the world and the self (GA24:423). All these different aspects, like disposedness, understanding, discourse, being with others, and disclosedness, belong to the holistic concept of being-in-the-world and can neither be reduced to this concept nor separated from each other.

Another holistic concept in *Being and Time* is CARE (*Sorge*), which contains equiprimordially the phenomena of DEATH (*Tod*), GUILT (*Schuld*), CONSCIENCE (*Gewissen*), FREEDOM (*Freiheit*), and FINITUDE (*Endlichkeit*, SZ 306, 372, 385). Furthermore, being is equiprimordial with TRUTH (SZ 230) and truth with certainty (*Gewissheit*, SZ 256; in the late 1930s, truth is also equiprimordial to ART, and truth and art are equiprimordial aspects of REALITY, GA6.1:220/N1 217). More astonishingly, being-there (*Dasein*) is equiprimordially in the truth and untruth (*Unwahrheit*, SZ 223, 229, 299), which can be related to Husserl's phenomenological claim that the revealing of one aspect of a phenomenon is only possible due to the concealing of another aspect. Consequently, for Heidegger the word (*das Wort*) is equiprimordial with disclosure (*Entbergung*) and concealment (*Verbergung*, e.g., GA54:112–13). This resembles the claim in *Was ist Metaphysik?*, his Freiburg inaugural lecture from 1929, that being (*das Sein*) can only be conceived with regard to the NOTHING (*Nichts*, GA9:115/91), which leads to the further claim that being and nothingness are equiprimordial (e.g., in *Das Ereignis* from 1941/42, GA71:133, and, with reference to *Was ist Metaphysik?*, in *Zur Seinsfrage* from 1955, GA9:421/318).

Heidegger uses the concept of equiprimordiality also in his characterizations of other philosophers. He claims that sensibility (*Sinnlichkeit*) and understanding (*Verstand*) are equiprimordial with knowledge (*Erkenntnis*) in the philosophy of Kant (GA25:91). Furthermore, the Kantian categories of quantity, quality, relation, and modality are equiprimordial according to Heidegger (GA25:258). Not least, Heidegger argues that the concepts of *appetitus* and *perceptio* are equiprimordial designations of the monad in the philosophy of Leibniz (GA9:94/75).

There are far more examples of equiprimordial phenomena and concepts in Heidegger's philosophy. One famous and awkward example can be found in his Freiburg Rectoral Address (*Rektoratsrede*) from 1933, where Heidegger declares that work service (*Arbeitsdienst*), military service (*Wehrdienst*), and service of knowledge (*Wissensdienst*) belong equiprimordially to the German essence (*zum deutschen Wesen*, GA16:114/HR 114). This obviously has no motivation in phenomenology and belongs to Heidegger's commitment to National Socialism.

Rico Gutschmidt

ERA (*ZEIT*). SEE TIME.

74.
ERRANCY (*IRRE*)

E RRANCY IS THE dimension of untruth in the ground of being itself. Errancy, in other words, is the ontological condition of all error (*der Irrtum*).

The term "errancy" is most prominently employed by Heidegger in the lecture "On the Essence of Truth" (GA9:177–202), which was first delivered in 1930 and then several times soon thereafter. The lecture was not published as an essay until 1943. Section 7 is titled "Untruth as Errancy," but his discussion of the topic is brief and dense. Nevertheless, the basic line of his thinking, as this can be discerned from sections 6 and 7, appears to be that human DASEIN is constitutively drawn ineluctably into involvement with particular entities. This involvement or "insistence" is marked by a twofold FORGETFULNESS: Dasein's constitutive insistence toward entities structurally entails (1) a concealment of entities as a whole, and (2) a concealment of this concealment, which he names "MYSTERY" (*das Geheimnis*).

This mystery, namely, this constitutive concealing of the concealment of entities as a whole, "holds sway throughout the Da-sein of human beings" (GA9:194/148). Mystery cannot be overcome by human beings, only resolutely recognized and accepted (*die Entschlossenheit zum Geheimnis*, GA9:198/151). Yet he also states that it is constitutive for human Dasein to be in flight from "mystery," and this flight from mystery he refers to as "erring" (*das Irren*): "the human being's flight from the mystery toward what is readily available, onward from one current thing to the next, passing the mystery by – this is erring" (GA9:196/150). Ontological errancy, as the condition of human erring, involves the compounded negativity of Dasein's "ek-sistence," and it "is not something that, as it were, extends alongside them [human beings] like a ditch into which they occasionally stumble; rather, errancy belongs to the inner constitution of the Da-sein into which historical human beings are admitted" (GA9:196/150).

Heidegger thus maintains that errancy "is the essential counteressence to the originary ESSENCE OF TRUTH" and "dominates human beings through and through" (GA9:197/151). As such, errancy is the "ground" of all error (*der Irrtum*). Error

> extends from the most ordinary wasting of time, making a mistake, and miscalculating, to going astray and venturing too far in one's essential attitudes and decisions. However, what is ordinarily and even according to the teachings of philosophy recognized as error, namely, incorrectness of judgments and falsity of knowledge, is only one mode of erring and, moreover, the most superficial one. (GA9:197/151)

Following Heidegger's line of thinking, then: particular errors are grounded in errancy, which is the untruth that belongs to the very essence of truth, which, in turn, is intimately related to the truth of essence, which, in turn, is related to the question of being (GA9:198/151–52). Consequently, his final suggestion in section 7 appears to be that errancy as untruth must be thought to be a feature of being itself. "Errancy" is the name of the dimension of untruth that is coiled within being itself as truth.

All of this raises several philosophical questions and difficulties that cannot be addressed here, but one observation is in order. The term "errancy," although often cited in the scholarly

literature, is short-lived in Heidegger's vocabulary; it appears on occasion in his writings in the 1930s but all but disappears after 1940. His concern in the 1930 lecture appears to have been to make a transition from the *Daseinsanalytik* in *Being and Time* to the thinking of being itself, and to mark out the negativity in the ground of being itself that pervades and plagues human being. Accordingly, what he was attempting to bring to language with the term "errancy" could be named in other ways as well, and he showed no commitment to this particular term in subsequent years.

So, for example, only a few years later in the lecture "The Origin of the Work of Art" (1935), he ventured the term "earth" to bring this irreducible dimension of concealment into view, and in his 1936 lecture course on Schelling, he worked out in his own distinctive way Schelling's understanding of evil in the ground of being. Then, too, of course, for the remainder of his lifetime of thinking, he thematized the intertwining of concealment and UNCONCEALMENT in being itself through his frequent elucidations of the Greek *Ur*-word ALÊTHEIA (*a-lêtheia*) and Heraclitus' saying, *phusis krypthesthai philei*. Admittedly, though, Heidegger's later reflections (after 1940) on concealment as intrinsic to being itself are far more existentially benign than in the early work, such as the 1930 lecture that so prominently featured this term "errancy." In this respect, there is a significant distance between the early and later Heidegger.

Richard Capobianco

75.
ESSENCE (*WESEN*)

Essence is the temporal unfolding of an entity in its "fulness." For Heidegger, "essence" (*Wesen*) has the temporal sense of "essencing," that is, unfolding.

In the German philosophical vocabulary, the word *Wesen*, like the English word "essence," translates the Latin *essentia* as this was understood in the long-standing metaphysical tradition of thinking. Thus, "essence" may also translate Plato's terms *eidos* and *idea*, Aristotle's *morphē*, *ousia*, and *to ti en einai*, and the medieval terms *quidditas* and *actualitas*. With respect to classical metaphysics, essence is the timeless essence of an entity, what something "really is" (*ontos on*), and therefore names the being of an entity, or more precisely in Heidegger's terminology, the BEINGNESS (*die Seiendheit*) of any particular entity.

Heidegger often takes note of this traditional philosophical usage of the word "essence," and he is sharply critical of it. In his view, the timeless character of essence (as beingness), which he sometimes, for emphasis, refers to as "essenceness" (*die Wesenheit*, GA9:260/199), must be deconstructed in order to uncover the fundamental character of being-as-time. Yet despite his critique of the traditional metaphysical notion of essence, he did not think it necessary to abandon this term; rather, in typical fashion, he attempted to retrieve its originary *temporal* sense in order to align the term with his fundamental understanding of being-as-time. Accordingly, it is characteristic for him to point out, as he does in "The Question Concerning Technology" (1953), that the substantive *das Wesen* is derived from the verb form *wesen*, which has the sense of *währen*, that is, of temporal LINGERING, lasting, enduring, abiding, whiling. "Everything that essences abides" (*Alles Wesende währt*), he observes (GA7:32/QCT 30). The essence of a being is not anything timeless after all, but rather what is temporally lasting or enduring or abiding. A being that shines forth and unfolds enduringly is a being that essences, that is, it *west*, as he often used this conjugated form of the verb *wesen* (GA7:31–33/QCT 30–32).

For Heidegger, then, this important term "essence" has the temporal, dynamic sense of essencing. To highlight and underscore this temporal sense, he sometimes employed another form of the word, *die Wesung* (the essencing), but he never simply replaced "essence" with "essencing." He continued to use essence in many different phrases and formulations. Yet if his distinctive understanding and rendering of essence are clear, this is not to say that there are not difficulties. He also often used the word to convey the comparatively more traditional sense of "what is most proper" to something, such as in his investigations into "the essence of poetry" (*das Wesen der Dichtung*), "the essence of history" (*das Wesen der Geschichte*), "the essence of freedom," (*das Wesen der Freiheit*), and "the essence of language" (*das Wesen der Sprache*). Admittedly, it is sometimes quite difficult to discern precisely how he employs "essence" and related adjectival forms of the word such as "essential" (*wesentlich*, *wesenhaft*) in certain texts and contexts.

Additionally, for translators of his work into English, this term has proven to be exceptionally vexing. Although "essencing" would appear to be the most literal and effective manner of translating the term as he employed it in his special and distinctive way, nevertheless

the word "essencing" has been deemed by some translators as so awkward or laden with metaphysical baggage that other renderings have been preferred, including "essential sway," "essential occurring," "happening," "presencing," and "unfolding," or "essential unfolding." Unfortunately, this wide variety of translations has added yet another degree of difficulty for readers of Heidegger in English.

One important expression used by Heidegger, *das Wesen des Seins* (or *das Wesen des Seyns*), may thus be translated as "the essencing of being" (or "the essencing of BEYNG"). Other translations for *Wesen* are possible, as noted, but the central matter for thought in these and similar formulations remains the same: being/beyng is the temporal-spatial unfolding wherein and whereby all entities come to be. That is, being/beyng essences as the temporal-spatial process – or way – by which, through which, and from out of which all entities emerge, linger in their appearance, and pass away. The dimension of concealment, withholding, reserve, or sheltering that is intrinsic to the "essencing of being/beyng" is sometimes characterized by Heidegger as the *Unwesen*, the "non-essencing," of this unitary unfolding process.

Richard Capobianco

EVENT OR EVENT OF APPROPRIATION (*EREIGNIS*). SEE ADAPTATION.

76.
EVERYDAYNESS (*ALLTÄGLICHKEIT*)

EVERYDAYNESS NAMES THE mode of EXISTENCE in which DASEIN shows itself primarily and usually. Heidegger focuses his analytic of Dasein on phenomena of everydayness so that, as he puts it, "this entity can show itself in itself and on its own terms" (SZ 16), and he claims that everydayness reveals essential characteristics of existence. Everydayness comprises most of the structures explained in Division I. Everyday Dasein shows up as competent, purposive, absorbed, discursive dealing with publicly interpreted possibilities. The concept of everydayness also plays a fundamental methodological role for Heidegger, structuring the relation between Division I and Division II.

With the methodological decision to focus on everydayness, Heidegger aims to avoid a mistake of traditional philosophy. The tradition, he claims, has dogmatically forced its interpretation of existence into ill-fitted categories and therefore missed or misinterpreted essential structures. An illustrative example may be the approach of Descartes' *Meditations*. Descartes strips his subject of involvement in everyday concerns and concludes that its essence lies in detached self-consciousness. Heidegger thinks that Descartes' approach leads him to miss the importance of skillful, unreflective absorption in ordinary tasks that underpin the higher cognitive tasks.

The German word *Alltag* connotes a vague generality that does not distinguish one day from the next, or one person's everyday from another's. *Der Alltag* is singular, but it means an impersonal, routine, monotonous recurrence over an indefinite timespan. In ordinary use, *alltäglich* is an antonym of "exceptional." Accordingly, a key feature of *Alltäglichkeit*, everyday*ness*, is a movement away from exceptionality and toward the usual, a tendency to smooth out differences and reinforce routines. Heidegger highlights this tendency and argues that an essential characteristic of Dasein is its concern to adhere to the normal way of doing things. The structures of everyday existence reinforce themselves and discourage radical breaks with the way things are primarily and usually done.

This has two distinct implications for Heidegger's existential analytic. First, Heidegger points out that everyday existence is quietly governed by public norms. "Dasein, as everyday being-with-one-another, stands in subjection to others. It itself is not; its being has been taken away by the others. Dasein's everyday possibilities of being are for the others to dispose of as they please" (SZ 126). As a person confronts ordinary situations, she deals with EQUIPMENT and possibilities in normal, publicly prescribed ways. She uses transportation, navigates her environment, and handles equipment and furniture as one generally does. Anything different, anything strikingly unusual, would not be "everyday" (*alltäglich*). Everydayness is public, it is lived in a world constituted by publicly understood equipment and possibilities, and it tends to reinforce rather than challenge such public understanding. One essential feature of Dasein that Heidegger brings out in his analysis of everydayness is that each Dasein exists first and foremost in an *average* way of being and only achieves its determinateness from within it (see AVERAGENESS). Accordingly Heidegger frequently characterizes everydayness as "average everydayness."

The second point that follows from the averageness of the everyday is that everydayness cannot fully reveal Dasein's structure. To be clear, Heidegger claims that his analysis of everydayness shows essential (*wesenhafte*) structures of Dasein. Nevertheless, it can at best provide a partial, incomplete glimpse of the ontological structures that make up existence. This is because in its subjection to the interpretations of the public, everyday Dasein covers up an understanding of its own contingency and finitude. So while everyday Dasein competently goes about its business the way anyone does, and while such absorption in the public is an essential aspect of the ontological constitution of Dasein, it impedes uncovering other aspects of its constitution. The analysis of everydayness is intrinsically limited.

Heidegger first indicates this intrinsic limitation with his distinction between inauthentic and authentic existence (see AUTHENTICITY). The characteristics of everyday existence show up as features of an existence that is not owned, or in which a person is not fully herself. She goes about her business as one does, dealing with entities according to a public understanding of how they are to be dealt with. She is constantly concerned to maintain and reinforce such a public understanding, and she tends to level down differences and novelties, passing them along as already understood elements of the public interpretation. "The self of such everyday Dasein," writes Heidegger, "is the ANYONE-self, which we distinguish from the authentic self, that is from the self that has been taken hold of in its own way" (SZ 129). The characteristics of an authentic, owned existence, on the other hand, do not reveal themselves in everydayness. For the most part they are only accessible to a phenomenological analysis of exceptional experiences. This is not to say that everyday Dasein must be inauthentic. While Heidegger often suggests this, he also insists that "authentic being-one's-self does not rest upon an exceptional condition of the subject, a condition that has been detached from the anyone; it is rather an existentiell modification of the anyone" (SZ 130). The most consistent reading of the text is that the analysis of everyday Dasein gives us an insight into the structures of existence that is not yet differentiated between unowned, lost, inauthentic existence on the one hand and owned, authentic existence on the other. When Heidegger explores the phenomena of being lost in the anyone and caught up in an ontologically inadequate self-conception, he characterizes inauthenticity. When he explores the phenomena of extreme and exceptional experiences he outlines authenticity. But both are grounded in, i.e., "are existentiell modifications" of, everydayness.

Heidegger also explains the intrinsic limitations of everydayness with a peculiar reflection on the notion of "wholeness" at the beginning of Division 11 of the book. An originary interpretation, he writes, "requires explicit assurance that the whole of the thematic entity has been brought into the fore-having" (SZ 232). Everydayness, however, cannot provide such an explicit focus on the whole of existence. "Everydayness is precisely that being which is 'between' birth and death. And if existence is definitive for Dasein's being, and if its essence is constituted in part by ABILITY-TO-BE, then, as long as Dasein exists, it must in each case as ability-to-be *not yet* be something" (SZ 233). In other words, a "WHOLE" existence encompasses the entire expanse from birth to death, but everydayness only occupies some time in the middle of this expanse. Heidegger's eventual solution to this conundrum is to recast the beginning and end of existence not as biographical birth and death but as existential GUILT and existential DEATH. He brings an interpretive focus onto the "wholeness" of existence by analyzing an authentic existence that takes over its own guilt and anticipates its own death in a mode of disclosure that he calls "fore-running RESOLUTENESS." At first this shift looks like a change of topics, where Heidegger

seems to dodge questions about the unity and identity of a person over time in favor of existentialism about contingency and finitude. However, the dialectic of Heidegger's argument is more complex than a simple change of topics. While he initially raises the question about wholeness in diachronic terms that are suggested by a reflection on everydayness, he eventually constructs a position according to which that very way of raising the question misses the basic structure of existence. In order to understand what gives identity to an existence over chronological Time, he argues, we must first explicate how existence can have a self-identity at all. He sets out to do this in his analyses of death, guilt, temporality, and historicality. Not only can everydayness not provide the solution to the "wholeness" of existence, it cannot even properly frame the question.

In the overall structure of *Being and Time*, then, everydayness is important as much for what it does not show as for what it shows. It serves as the phenomenal basis of the positive analyses of Division I, where it shows Dasein as it is first and foremost, in its absorbed engagement with the world. It reveals the primary structures of being-in-the-world and the public nature of the competences and disposedness that constitute disclosure. It is the focal point of existential phenomenology, the key to Heidegger's claim that Dasein must be understood as a who, not a what, in terms of existentialia, not categories. But everydayness cannot show Dasein at its limit-situations, when the phenomenology of everyday existence breaks down. It cannot show the deeper phenomena of our existential constitution. For that Heidegger turns to the exceptional, decidedly non-everyday phenomenology of limit-situations such as guilt and death, which display the basic contingency and self-grounding structures of everyday disposed abilities.

In Division II everydayness accordingly functions as a foil for Heidegger's analyses of guilt and death. Everydayness covers up, rather than reveals, exceptional existential phenomena, because everyday existence tends to normalize and depersonalize the understanding of death, conscience, and guilt. For example, Heidegger points out that everyday Dasein flees from death, rather than facing it authentically. The public understanding of death treats it as a distant future event that befalls one in general, but not me, not now. In doing so, the everyday mode of talking and thinking about death does not allow for genuine anxiety about death and "cultivates a superior indifference that alienates Dasein from its ownmost non-relational ability-to-be" (SZ 254). Further, the everyday self cannot hear the call of conscience. Everyday self-understanding depends on being sensitive to the public interpretation of one's dealings. But in thus "losing itself in the publicness and the idle talk of the anyone, it fails to hear its own self in listening to the anyone-self" (SZ 271). Finally, everyday understanding does not grasp the existential sense of guilt. In the existential sense, Dasein is constitutively guilty insofar as it cannot get behind its own ground. Actions that constitute legal and moral debt and guilt in the ordinary sense are only possible on the basis of this originary existential guilt. The everyday interpretation, however, thinks that guilt is subsequent to such actions. While this everyday interpretation reveals some indication of the originary sense, it "perverts the signification" in taking the derivative phenomenon as basic (SZ 281).

After his phenomenology of the exceptional experiences of guilt and death, Heidegger launches a transcendental argument about the temporal deep structure of existence. He argues that a unitary structure of originary future, past, and present makes sense of existence. Accordingly, temporality shows up in various aspects of everyday existence, and Heidegger devotes a chapter to *Temporality and Everydayness*, in which he shows that everyday phenomena

of UNDERSTANDING, DISPOSEDNESS, FALLING, and DISCOURSE instantiate this underlying TEMPORALITY. Indeed, the evident temporal facets of the phenomena of Dasein's "everydayness" and its mode of showing itself "proximally and for the most part" (*zunächst und zumeist*) indicate an intimate connection between the transcendental deep structure and everydayness. "At bottom, the term 'everydayness' means nothing other than temporality, and this makes the being of Dasein possible, so an adequate conceptual delimitation of everydayness can only succeed within the framework of a fundamental consideration of the SENSE of being in general and its possible variations" (SZ 372). Heidegger intended to carry out this fundamental consideration of being in the unwritten third division of *Being and Time*, and evidently everydayness was to have a basic role in that discussion.

Stephan Käufer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 16–17, 43–44, 50–51, 113–16, 126–30, 166–67, 181, 189, 232–35, 252–55, 281, 331–35, 370–72; GA3:234–36; GA20:207–10, 335–45, 435–38; GA29/30:398–400; GA63:85–87, 93–95, 98–100

EVERYONE, THE (*DAS MAN*). SEE ANYONE, THE.

(COMPOSITIVE) EXISTENCE (*BESTAND*). SEE STANDING RESERVE.

EXISTENCE (*DASEIN*). SEE DASEIN.

77.
EXISTENCE (*EXISTENZ*)

Existence (Existenz) is for Heidegger a term of art that signifies the kind of being of human beings or of Dasein. Something that exists understands itself in terms of a distinctive possibility: the possibility of deciding to be itself or not be itself (SZ 12). Thus, an existing being is one that is never reducible to its present properties – there is always something about it which is outstanding or which remains to be determined (see SZ 233).

Existenz, which comes from the Latin *existentia*, traditionally means the existence of an entity. In scholastic philosophy existence is defined in correlation with essence: *essentia* refers to what a being is while *existentia* is the quality whereby an entity is. Heidegger, however, gives existence a new meaning and applies it exclusively to Dasein. He uses the term "existence" as a formal indication of Dasein's ownmost possibility. In his early *Critical Remarks on Karl Jaspers's "Psychology of Worldviews"* (1919/21), he points out that existence should be methodologically understood as a formal indication of the sense of "I am" (GA9:10/9). In *Ontology – The Hermeneutics of Facticity* (1923), existence designates the being of *Dasein*, the formal indication of *Dasein*'s ownmost possibility (GA63:16–19).

In the context of *Being and Time* (1927) the term "existence" is employed exclusively for Dasein, which understands itself in terms of its existence: the possibility to be itself or not itself. Existence is not a given property but something that human beings have to be (*Zu-sein*). Dasein is certainly an entity, but a peculiar one that is different from minerals, stars, plants, animals, and equipment. Dasein – as the being we already have to be in each case – is constituted by existence. Dasein has no substantial essence in the way that other entities do. More precisely, existence is the being that Dasein always becomes through its comportment to itself, one way or another: "*the 'essence' of Dasein lies in its existence*" (SZ 42). Thus, existence denotes Dasein's special way of being, a way of being in which its own being "is an issue" for it. For many of Heidegger's contemporaries, this characterization of human beings suggested parallels with Kierkegaard's and Jaspers's philosophy of existence. However, Heidegger flatly denies any kind of existentialist affiliation in his course of 1941 on Schelling (GA49:17–73).

From an ontological point of view, Dasein invariably understands itself on the basis of its existence as the possibility of being itself or not. Accordingly, existence can be authentic or inauthentic, but no matter what kind of existence we decide to grasp, every decision and action is, in each case, mine. Heidegger highlights the specific mineness, the always-being-mine (*Jemeinigkeit*) as a structural moment of *Dasein* (SZ 42–43). Because my being is mine, it is always an issue for me – it is the special way of being that Heidegger calls "existence." This means that we will never understand human beings adequately if we treat them as things. Dasein has to decide who he or she is. We are neither simple things nor pure spectators, but engaged and transformative actors.

The basic question of *Being and Time* is the question of the meaning of being, but before we can ask this question, we must have some familiarity with being. We do have what Heidegger calls a "vague average understanding of being" (SZ 5). Where do we begin? Heidegger makes

a crucial suggestion: we should begin by interrogating the entity who is capable of the act of interrogation – namely, ourselves. *Being and Time*'s existential analytic revolves around the explanation of our own way of being. It would probably be more conventional to speak of our essence, but Heidegger wants to avoid any kind of traditional term that could distort the understanding of our own being. In fact, traditional ontology distinguishes between the nature of something (its essence) and its being (its existence). A dog can be defined in its essence as a mammal; its existence is another matter altogether.

What it means to exist for something with the nature of a rock, a rose, or a dog is very different from what it means to exist for something with the nature of a human being. Rocks, roses, dogs, and humans are all there in the world, but only humans exist. Thus, minerals, plants, and animals are determined by physical and biological laws such as preservation and reproduction. Obviously, human beings are also subjected to the same laws, but what distinguishes them from the rest of entities is their way of dealing with these laws and the attitude they adopt toward their being. That's why Heidegger prefers to use the neutral term "Dasein" instead of traditionally loaded concepts, such as "human being," "subject," "consciousness," "spirit," "soul," or even "person." It expresses the idea that Dasein's being consists of its comporting understandingly toward its being, indeed toward being in general. In the important lectures *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics* (1929/30), Heidegger proposes that stones do not establish any type of active relationship with the world. They are world-less entities, simply occurrent. Animals, on the contrary, have a kind of access to entities and they exhibit some sort of behavior in their relationship with the world, but they have no understanding of being. Accordingly, organisms of all kinds evidently perceive things and even deal with them in an intelligent manner, if only instinctively, but they have no understanding of what things are, or what it means for anything to be (GA29/30:289–94, 358–62). Thus, animals are world-poor while Dasein is world-constituting. Dasein's being is characterized by the fact of deciding which kind of person we want to be. We are responsible for our own lives. We choose, in each moment, a possibility of existence. For instance, I decide to run a marathon instead of going to a concert; I prefer to read a book and not watch TV; I opt to use public transportation to go to my workplace at the university. I am building my identity as I am living. I become what I am through my decisions – some conscious, some unconscious – and through my actions – some voluntary, some involuntary. Stones and animals are simply what they are. They cannot have an identity crisis since they do not have to determine their own existence.

As Heidegger emphatically points out in *Being and Time*, only Dasein exists in the strict sense of the word. We have to conceive ourselves in a new way. Classically, we are defined as rational and political animals. However, what really characterizes us and sets us apart is our way of being, our mode of existing. As mentioned previously, *our* way of existing is qualitatively different from the way in which a rock, a rose, or a dog exists. As Heidegger puts it, the term Dasein is "purely an expression of being" (SZ 12), and Dasein's being must be conceived in terms of its existence. Which way of being distinguishes us? Being there as existing in an already open and meaningful world. Of course, a rock is "there" in the sense of having a spatial location, but we, as Dasein, are "there" in a much richer sense: we inhabit a world and have a certain understanding of ourselves. Not only are we there, we have to be in the sense that we have an opportunity or possibility to determine ourselves.

The concept of existence indicates Dasein's openness. We can say that existence is appropriate as a name for our being because we *ek-sist*. Here, Heidegger uses "existence" in the etymological sense of *ex-sistere*: we transcend ourselves, we go beyond ourselves. In

other words, we stand out into future possibilities, into a past heritage, and into a present world. Unlike rocks, roses, and dogs, we are not encapsulated in a present moment and position – we essentially reach out from ourselves and constitute a world. Because we do so, our own being matters to us. In fact, shortly after the publication of *Being and Time*, he starts using the spelling ᴇᴋ-ꜱɪꜱᴛᴇɴᴄᴇ (*Ek-sistenz*) to rethink Dasein from the perspective of the history of being. To put it differently, Dasein is thrown into the openness of being by transcending and projecting itself as well as by standing out in the openness of time. For the most part, we are immersed and absorbed in our daily concerns; an immersion that Heidegger later starts calling "insistence" (*Insistenz*) in contrast to "ek-sistence" (*Eksistenz*). It is not a question of imposing a set of rules on our existence, but rather a matter of letting it freely be and become what we already are. To avoid confusions with Jaspers's *Philosophy of Existence* (1931), existence is replaced by other words, especially "steadfastness" (*Inständigkeit*) (Dahlstrom 2013b, 71, and Inwood 1999, 61).

Jesús Adrián Escudero

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 12, 42, 53, 117, 152, 179, 192, 212, 221, 233, 260–79, 287, 295–301, 303, 307–08, 313–14, 325, 343, 363, 383, 387; GA9:10/8–9, 15/11, 24/20, 28/22, 33–35/26–29; GA17:3, 16, 21; GA21:402; GA22:4; GA24:26, 37, 61, 90, 138, 221–24, 241–42, 299, 309–11, 317–20, 391, 395–405, 417, 454; GA59:35, 37–38, 82, 84, 86–87, 91; GA60:68, 128, 136, 148, 150, 155–56, 179, 201, 231–34, 249, 255, 265–66

EXISTENT (*VORHANDEN*). SEE OCCURRENT.

78.

EXISTENTIAL (*EXISTENZIAL*) AND EXISTENTIELL (*EXISTENZIELL*)

"Existential" refers to the ontological structures of human existence, formally defined as being-there (Dasein).

"Existentiell" signifies a particular, ontic realization or instantiation of Dasein's ontological structures.

Heidegger introduces the pair of concepts existential/existentiell as part of his analysis of human existence. He wants to establish a clear distinction between the fundamental determinations that constitute the modes of being of *Dasein*'s existence (existential level) and the concrete reality of each person's individual life (existentiell level). In other words, existential represents the *ontological* and purely formal characters of Dasein while existentiell is used when describing the ontic dimension of any person. It is one thing to formally determine existence as care and another completely different thing to take care of something specific, such as cutting the grass in my yard, washing my car, looking after my students, or taking my dog to the veterinarian.

Thus, existentiell applies to the range of possibilities open to Dasein, and the choices it makes – or evades – among them. If someone chooses and decides to be a football player, a lawyer, or a philosopher, then we are dealing with existentiell matters. However, the very possibility of choosing and understanding the choice is in itself a constitutive moment of every Dasein. It is an ontological structure or, if we borrow Kant's terminology, a formal condition of possibility of existence itself. (For a closer analysis of Heidegger's proximity to Kant's transcendental philosophy, see Blattner 2006, 3f., Carman 2003, 23–30, Lafont 2007.)

Dasein is ontically distinguished from all other entities by the fact that, in its being, it has an understanding of being. I understand what it means for me and other entities to be. Of course, my understanding of myself and other entities is, to begin with, *existentiell*: I do not have any explicit notion about being, but I simply exist and deal with diverse kinds of entities and situations. This competence involves an implicit understanding of being. If I decide to make this understanding explicit, I can develop an ontological analysis of my existence.

The aim of *Being and Time*'s existential analytic is to phenomenologically show the ontological structures of Dasein and conceptually articulate its different modes of being. In this sense, the existential analytic seeks to reach a genuine, primary, pre-theoretical understanding of Dasein's being. It is not a question of finding the unchanging essence of our existence, but rather showing the different ways of actualizing it in each case. In the frame of what the young Heidegger calls, during his first years in Freiburg, a primordial science of life (GA56/57 and GA58), he refers to the terms "hermeneutical categories" and "formal indication" as the only way of describing factical life without theoretically distorting it (GA60). In his lectures *Ontology – The Hermeneutics of Facticity* (1923), he starts using the expression "existential" (GA63), and in his treatise of 1924, *The Concept of Time* (GA64), we find formulations like "ontological characters" (*Seinscharaktere*), "fundamental characters" (*Grundcharaktere*),

"fundamental structures" (*Grundstrukturen*), and "fundamental determinations" (*Grundbestimmungen*). Consequently, the totality of existentialia or ontological structures that makes up *Dasein*'s existence is called existentiality (*Existenzialität*, SZ 12).

Furthermore, Heidegger also distinguishes "existentialia" from categories. *Existentialia* (*Existenzialen*) are different modes of being that have to be enacted in each case. In contrast, *categories* define the nature of entities other than Dasein (like nature, equipment, minerals, animals, real things, ideal objects, etc.). A hammer, for instance, is an occurrent entity, ready to be used by us, which possesses certain qualities (color, form, weight, or resistance) and is categorically determined by space, time, relation, and causality. Whereas categories answer the question of *what* something is and describe the objective content of entities, *existentialia* determine *how* we are comprehensively dealing with things, situations, and other people that we encounter in our relationship with the world, including ourselves. Categories define the properties of things, and in doing so, they describe human existence as a thing among other things, as an entity simply occurrent – that is, they reduce existence to a static object of reflection and observation. On the other hand, *existentialia* formally indicate the modes of being in the world. *Existentialia* – such as everydayness, worldliness, publicity, concern, being-with, solicitude, fallenness, disposedness, understanding, anxiety, death, guilt, and conscience, among others – do not determine what we do in specific situations but rather establish the way we are in each case in the world. For Heidegger, Dasein is not a thing at all. Dasein is not a "what," an occurrent being. Dasein is a "who," whose existence is always at stake. In order to understand ourselves, we have to look at how we exist. This undercuts the traditional distinction between *what* something is and the fact *that* it is. As Heidegger puts it, Dasein is the "entity whose *what* is precisely to be and nothing but to be" (GA20:152).

Jesús Adrián Escudero

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA17:110, 116; GA20: 328, 338, 389; GA21:402–03; GA60:16, 31, 44; GA64:17–44; SZ 12–14, 184–85, 237, 295, 302–03, 310, 313–14

79.
EXPECTING (*ERWARTUNG*)

Expecting is an attitude directed at possible future events, in which one regards them as probable or likely to occur. Heidegger says, "as care, Dasein is essentially ahead of itself" (SZ 337). Obviously, expecting is one way of being ahead of oneself. However, as *Being and Time* §68 ("The Temporality of Disclosedness in General," SZ 335–46) explains, expecting and Awaiting (*Gewärtigen*) are not the same. Awaiting is the ground of expectation; expectation arises from the existentiell understanding of the future in terms of specific possibilities. Heidegger says, "*only because* factical Dasein *is* thus *awaiting* its ability-to-be, and *is awaiting* this ability in terms of that with which it concerns itself, can it *expect* [*erwarten*] anything and wait for it" (SZ 337). Thus, in expecting Dasein is ahead of itself inauthentically: "inauthentic understanding projects itself upon that with which one can concern oneself, or upon what is feasible, urgent, or indispensable in our everyday business" (SZ 337).

For example, in the discussion of being-toward death (§53), Heidegger remarks, "Dasein comports itself toward something possible in its possibility by *expecting* it [*im Erwarten*]" (SZ 261). He says further: "to expect something possible is always to understand it and to 'have' it with regard to whether and when and how it will be actually occurrent" (SZ 262). I expect [*erwarten*] something because I wait [*warten*] for the actualization of something already given. If I expect something, then I already understand the possibilities that are available for what I am expecting: I expect to meet my friend at noon; meeting her is already given me as a possibility and I expect that possibility to come about. Indeed, Heidegger distinguishes between waiting for an event, expecting it (*Erwarten*), and waiting on it (*Warten*, GA61:184). The latter is a matter of care, something constant, even if not explicit, whereas waiting for is explicit and episodic.

Expectation is always a matter of the actual more than the possible: in expectation "the possible is drawn into the actual, arising out of the actual and returning to it" (SZ 262; see Possibility). In other words, in expectation what is possible, meeting my friend at noon, arises out of the actual – the habits and customs of meeting for lunch are already given – and meeting my friend becomes actual when we do what one does to meet for lunch. That possibility "returns" the actual. Nothing radically new happens.

To say that expectation is tied to the actual rather than the possible means that expectation is a function of the possible as something already given by the past rather than as genuinely futural. Expectation is grounded in the possibilities given by the past. Heidegger says, "a future event [*Das Zukünftige*] of the kind that we *expect* is that-which-has-not-yet-become-present [*Gegenwart*], that which is wished for or dreaded with respect to the present as something potentially present" (GA64:58). The possible future event is given us by the possibilities of the past.

I expect what I have already been given as possible; I expect to catch a cold next winter because that possibility is already given as part of the relations I have with others and with my surroundings. Expectation is, therefore, an inauthentic understanding of the future, one that "awaits . . . *in terms of that which yields or denies the object of its concern*" (SZ 337). My expectation of

getting a cold is an expecting of that possibility as an event that will either confirm my fear, when I get a cold, or deny it, when I don't.

Fear is an instance of expectation: I fear that which is already given as a possibility. In contrast, ANXIETY is not an instance of expecting: "to be anxious in-the-face-of . . . does not have the character of an expecting [*Erwartung*]" (SZ 343). That is precisely because in anxiety there is no specific already given future event that I await in my future.

James E. Faulconer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Expecting SZ 21–262, 335–46; GA61:184; GA64:58; GA66:353
Expectation of the *parousia* GA60:102–03, 106–07, 110, 114, 290; GA66:245
Expectation and restraint GA65:69

FURTHER READING

Hodge 1995, 13, 63, 106–07, 189, Mulhall 1996, 148–49

80.
EXPERIENCE (*ERFAHRUNG*)

E XPERIENCE IS A non-deficient mode in which DASEIN genuinely encounters entities, discloses its embeddedness in the WORLD, and discovers its belongingness to BEING. Experience arises in Dasein's involvement in the world by which it is affected, thus rendering distinctions between an essentially closed internal sphere of the subject and a separate external sphere of objects untenable. Although the textual history reveals repeated reformulations and perspectival shifts (e.g., between a focus on individual and on collective experience respectively), Heidegger continuously seeks to define experience in opposition to understandings of the term common in both everyday language and modern philosophical discourse: it is not conceived as an attitude consciously assumed by a sovereign subject in order to make or have experiences, but, instead, as a way of taking over one's being exposed to "a thing, a person, or a god" (GA12:149/OWL 57). Further, experience is not conceived as an internal occurrence, i.e., as a certain status of a subject's inner life. Instead, in experience, Dasein's unique situatedness and constitution come to light: its being interwoven with the environment and with-world, its being integrated into the FOURFOLD, and its being claimed by being.

In the 1919 lecture course *Die Idee der Philosophie und das Weltanschauungsproblem* (GA56/57), Heidegger addresses the topic of experience under the heading of LIVED EXPERIENCE (*Erlebnis*) and with special reference to modern SCIENCE. According to his critical analysis, scientific practice has not only lost the connection to fundamental lived experience; what is more, it has decisively shaped the "de-vivified" manner in which modern men understand themselves and the world. Based on these considerations, Heidegger proposes an "authentic spiritual revolution" (cf. GA56/57:4) to overcome the predominance of the sterile, objectifying scientific attitude: a new receptivity for primordial vital phenomena broadens the horizon of "worldly" experience as well as of "pre-worldly" experienceability and, thus, allows for an increased "intensity of life" (GA56/57:115). In contrasting the (deficient) theoretical I with the (fulfilled) historical I and in expounding the conditions of a transformative passage between these comportments, Heidegger's early remarks on lived experience in substance initiate his reflections on experience and anticipate his thoughts on ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*).

Subsequently, Heidegger modifies the terminology in which he refers to experience. Coinciding with a shift in his philosophical concern from LIFE to being, experience replaces lived experience, which now is associated with voluntaristic and emotivist attitudes that are momentary and, thus, tied to FALLING. In contrast, proper experience does not only take place beyond the realm of willing and feeling, but also beyond the realm of consciousness. In the 1925 lecture course *Prolegomena zur Geschichte des Zeitbegriffs* and in *Being and Time*, Heidegger elaborates this point in a critical discussion of Husserl's approach to phenomenology and, especially, of his concept of "natural attitude" (GA20:150ff.).

To further substantiate that experience is irreducible to an inner attitude, Heidegger draws on etymology: in Middle High German, the precursor of the modern verb *erfahren* ("to experience")

designates "to journey" or "to venture out." This meaning is central to Heidegger's interpretation of Sophocles' *Antigone* in the 1935 *Introduction to Metaphysics*. There, experience is characterized as an important aspect of the human condition of being "on the way" and "not at home" amidst the "uncanny" (GA40:153ff./153ff.). This highlights the extent to which experience lies outside man's power of disposition: Authentic experience is only possible because humans are not in control, because their existence is exposed, precarious, and ungrounded.

This line of thought is continued, albeit in modified form, in Heidegger's interpretations of Hölderlin's poetry. Based on his readings of, inter alia, *The Ister* (1942, GA53) and *Remembrance* (1943), Heidegger unfolds what he calls the "law of historicality." According to this law, one first has to ex-perience (*er-fahren*) – the hyphen stresses the aspect of "venturing out" – "the foreign" in order to enable "the homecoming return to the origin of what is [one's] own" (GA4:118–19/141). Here, the focus is directed at the specific experiential constellation between "own" and "foreign" as it manifests itself in what Heidegger describes as a relation of meaningful polarity between "the Germans" and "the Greeks." Applied to the historical situation of the Germans, experience becomes essential for a process mediated by alterity, which allows them to disclose their collective identity. These considerations are integral to Heidegger's discourse on "self-examination" or "self-mindfulness" developed not only in engaging with Hölderlin's poetizing, but also in reaction to his ill-fated political activism in support of Nazism, which was guided by the notion of self-assertion suggestive of unmediated access to SELFHOOD.

The converging thematic strands of Heidegger's enduring intellectual engagement with experience crystallize in his later thinking: On the one hand, Heidegger emphasizes that experience requires a comportment of receptivity, responsiveness, and openness toward that which "approaches" or "concerns" humans. This refers to, e.g., destinal sendings such as the INVENTORY (GA9:313ff./239ff.; GA79:24ff.; see SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT(ION)ING), to LANGUAGE (cf. GA12:147ff./OWL 57ff.), or to THINGS (GA79:5ff.). Rather than representing objects in order to calculate with and make use of them, experiencing things – such as, paradigmatically, a jug – discloses the way in which they address and affect humans. On the other hand, Heidegger shows that experience is not only profoundly transformative with regard to self- and world-conceptions prevalent in the technological age, but constitutive of identity: in revealing to humans their unique capacity to "dwell in the world as world" (GA79:21/PLT 180) and their essential "*belonging*-together" (GA79:125) with "being," it lets them come into their "own," "into what we name *adaptation* [*Ereignis*]" (*ibid*.).

The 1969 essay *Art and Space* illustrates Heidegger's mature understanding of experience in contrasting two approaches to space. As opposed to the "physical-technological" way, in which modern science "projects" space (GA13:205ff.) as empty and homogeneous, therefore measurable and controllable, the phenomenon is genuinely experienced "artistically": in the sculptures of Eduardo Chillida or in the paintings of Paul Cézanne space is not distorted through representation and objectification; instead, their works let space show and unfold itself as they "embody" places and, thus, creatively "institute" meaningful "regions" for human "dwelling."

The overall development of Heidegger's considerations on experience reflects his consistent concern with decentering the subject. It is characterized by the attempt to challenge and supersede the notion that experience is something that can be deliberately "made." As indicated in the linking of experience and happenings (*Erfahrung* and *Widerfahrnis*), experience is rather grasped as an accident or *pathos* in the literal sense, i.e., as something that "befalls" humans, as something they "suffer." Significant aspects of Heidegger's understanding of experience are

taken up in, e.g., Jean-Luc Nancy's theory of meaning and Bernhard Waldenfels's phenomenology of the alien (cf. Nancy 2000; Waldenfels 2011). By paying particular attention to experiences of intersubjectivity and sociality rich in ethical and political implications, both authors importantly complement Heidegger's thinking.

Florian Grosser

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA1:10/BH 25–26; GA1: 85, 128–33, 140–41, 151, 284; GA2:12, 30, 130, 228, 244, 270–71, 316, 324, 370, 388, 391, 429, 561–62; GA3:7, 9–11, 14, 17, 48–49, 103, 116–19, 131–33, 189, 239, 257, 280–81; GA5:115ff./86ff., 125–27/94–96, 180ff./135ff.; GA13:16, 56, 208, 232, 234; GA14:63, 84, 125; GA15:284/FS 9, 302/FS 19–20, 312–13/FS 25–26, 327/FS 35–36, 330/FS 37, 349/FS 50, 383/FS 71, 394/FS 77, 398/FS 80; GA16:205, 298, 335, 618, 672–73, 678/HR327, 330, 771; GA17:103, 146, 239, 284, 286, 302, 312–13, 327, 329–30, 349, 381, 383, 392, 394, 398, 429, 432, 437; GA18:39–40, 135, 198, 271, 273, 338; GA19:67, 452, 618; GA20:2, 6, 15–16, 66, 152, 154–55, 162, 169, 174, 179, 197, 201, 295, 335, 367, 380, 403, 423; GA21:103, 227, 247, 285–86, 296, 315–18; GA22:7, 9, 26, 51, 208, 210; GA24:30, 205, 250, 331, 333, 346, 349, 358, 396; GA25:156, 158, 182, 206–07, 219, 326–35; GA27:182, 210, 278–85, 295; GA28:116; GA29/30:37, 391, 397, 513; GA31:45, 151–53, 169–71, 178, 269–73; GA32:24–37, 90; GA33:73–75, 91–92; GA34:12–13, 134; GA35:6, 75, 115, 217; GA36/37:248; GA38:126/105; GA39:33, 64, 80, 100, 104, 112, 143, 147, 173, 180, 220; GA40: 101/99, 142/142, 201/205–06; GA41:25–27, 49, 128–30, 147, 207–10, 214, 226–31, 240–46; GA42:25, 35, 143; GA43:38, 190, 290; GA44:28, 126, 145, 181, 195, 217; GA45:22, 100, 103, 116, 126, 196–98, 204–06; GA46:26; GA47:278; GA48:99, 103, 147–48, 216, 278, 282, 311, 335; GA49:58, 61–63, 140; GA50:5, 105, 107, 112, 156; GA51:39, 42, 85–86; GA52:91; GA53:92, 117, 167; GA54:41–42, 114, 136, 167, 179, 183, 190, 249–50; GA55:64, 89, 99, 241, 279, 293; GA56/57:60, 104; GA58:32, 56, 61, 66–72, 83, 85, 92, 101–02, 113–14, 116, 120–23, 156, 164–66, 178, 208–10, 218, 220, 227, 253, 259; GA59:36–37, 169–71, 182; GA60:9, 11, 13, 20, 53, 69, 83, 128, 214, 217, 240, 275, 281, 292–94; GA61:20, 35, 82, 91, 93; GA62:229, 300; GA64:33, 40; GA65:26, 37, 61, 159–60, 165, 180, 219, 233, 248, 255, 289, 348, 350, 412, 426, 464, 469, 483; GA66:90, 98, 153, 259, 311, 317, 344, 376, 415; GA67:8, 17–18, 23, 59, 193, 226, 251, 253, 261, 267; GA68:97, 101–06, 111–22, 124–36, 138, 143–46, 150; GA69:143, 158, 170; GA70:97; GA71:3, 24, 27–30, 42, 78, 88, 105, 123, 144, 160–62, 172, 184, 193–96, 209–11, 218–20, 233–37, 240, 255, 278–80, 282–84, 288–89, 295–96, 305, 310; GA74:18, 193; GA75:10, 25, 167, 219, 351; GA76:113, 154, 279; GA77:120, 122, 163, 179, 218–19; GA78:19, 57, 69, 150–51, 189–90, 299–302; GA79:100, 106, 142, 154–55, 175; GA81:46, 224, 229; GA86:190, 194, 274, 379–82, 409–13, 415–25, 679, 728; GA87:84, 100, 206, 222; GA88:8, 18, 40, 42, 214; GA90:27, 92, 266, 277

FURTHER READING

Nancy 2000, Waldenfels 2011

EXPERIENCE (*ERLEBNIS*). SEE LIVED EXPERIENCE.

EXPLICIT (*AUSDRÜCKLICH*). SEE EXPRESS.

EXPOSITION (*AUSLEGUNG*). SEE INTERPRETATION.

81.
EXPRESS (*AUSDRÜCKLICH, AUSDRÜCKEN*)

For Heidegger, something is express (*ausdrücklich*) when it is salient. So to express (*ausdrücken*) something is to bring it into relief or salience, making it stand out. Oftentimes, Heidegger discusses *possibilities* as that which becomes express. A knife, for example, might afford chopping throughout the day. But as I become hungry in the late afternoon, this possibility becomes salient or express.

Ausdruck is the German word for expression, which captures both linguistic and non-linguistic expressions (e.g., facial expressions); and Heidegger often uses *Ausdruck* with this ordinary meaning. For example, Heidegger calls the linguistic term *Sein* an *expression*. However, the terms connected to *Ausdruck* take on technical meanings within Heidegger's discussion of UNDERSTANDING and INTERPRETATION, especially in *Being and Time* and the *History of the Concept of Time*.

It is in these contexts that "to express" (*ausdrücken*) means quite literally to "press out," or bring into salience. Heidegger likely wanted his reader to hear the prefix *aus-* ("out-"), which can be found in a wide range of terms that Heidegger associates with interpretation (*Auslegung*). For Heidegger, interpretation is both the development or refinement (*Ausbildung*) of the understanding and the "working out" or appropriation (*Ausarbeitung*) of that which is understood (SZ 149). In the process of working out what we understand, certain parts of our understanding get "pressed-out" or become express, while other parts of our understanding remain in the background.

We see this structure in what Heidegger calls "CIRCUMSPECTION," which is the kind of interpretation that discovers the AVAILABLE (SZ 149). In *Being and Time*, Heidegger explains that in circumspection, "the 'world' which has already been understood comes to be interpreted. The available comes *expressly* into the sight which understands" (149). For Heidegger, understanding constitutes a basic grip on possibilities, or the ways things might play out. But what I primarily understand, for Heidegger, isn't a single AFFORDANCE in isolation; but rather a whole network of meaningful affordances, or what Heidegger would call a "WORLD." Interpretation allows certain possibilities or affordances to become express or stand out from the background of the world.

My understanding of a cup, for example, is constituted by the way it affords the possibility of drinking. This understanding persists even when I'm dealing with all of the other tools in my kitchen. When I comport or direct myself toward the cup in particular, the cup – which affords drinking as an available entity – becomes express from out of the background of all of the other tools in the kitchen. The cup and the possibility for drinking become express, while other tools and possibilities fade into the background.

Because understanding primarily discloses the world as a whole, it is possible for something to be understood, but still "veiled," or "hidden" in our background understanding. Heidegger says that when we understand a totality or whole of affordances, this understanding "hides [*birgt*] in itself the expressness of the reference relations (of the 'in-order-to') which belong to that totality" (SZ 149). One's understanding of an entire referential context might disclose that the cup, for example, is for the POSSIBILITY of drinking. But this possibility, which is disclosed in understanding, remains "veiled" prior to an interpretive act that expresses this possibility (SZ 150), or makes it stand out

while other possibilities remain in the background. Interpretation has the function of discovering entities, and in doing so brings them out of hiding, making them express.

Heidegger draws an important connection between expressness and the AS-STRUCTURE of interpretation. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger says, "the 'as' makes up the structure of the expressness of something that is understood. It constitutes the interpretation" (149). In a parallel passage from *History of the Concept of Time*, Heidegger says that interpretation "brings to prominence [*bringt das zur Hebung*] the 'as-what'" (GA20:359). What we primarily understand are possibilities, and we make these possibilities express though an interpretive act of *taking-as*.

One mode of taking-as, in which we make something express, is through LANGUAGE. For example, Heidegger says that the ASSERTION "this chair is yellow and upholstered" gives expression (*Ausdruck*) to the perception of the chair (GA20:75). The assertion makes certain relations stand out from the unarticulated (*unabgehobener*) totality in which these relations are originally found (GA20:76).

But Heidegger maintains that the "*apophantical* 'as'" of assertion is derivative of the "existential-*hermeneutical* 'as'" of circumspection (SZ 158). In other words, making things salient through a linguistic act is founded on the more basic way that we make things salient in circumspection. Since verbal expression (*Wortausdruck*), or language (*Sprache*), depends on this more basic way of taking-as (GA20:360), we typically make something express without the use of words. Heidegger maintains that even our simplest perceptions involve expression (GA20:74), despite the absence of language.

Because of the priority of non-linguistic ways of making things express, it is important for those reading translations of Heidegger to track the terms used to translate both *ausgesprochen* and *ausdrücklich*. If these terms are conflated, then Heidegger would seem to be making conflicting claims about the relationship between interpretation and language in passages where each of these terms appears (e.g., SZ 149). The potential source of confusion is that either term (along with the German *explizit*) can be reasonably translated into English as "explicit." But *aussprechen* is distinct from *ausdrücken* in Heidegger, in that the former covers only linguistic acts of expression.

Macquarrie and Robinson translate the German term *ausgesprochen* with "expressed," and (in contrast to what is suggested above) they use "explicit" or "explicitly" to translate the German term *ausdrücklich*. Their translation choices work, as long as we keep in mind that a circumspective act of making explicit needn't involve a linguistic act of speaking out. In other words, in circumspection, we make things *explicit* or *express* by simply allowing certain parts of our understanding to become salient or "pressed out."

Kevin Gin

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 148–50, 158; GA20:74–76, 359–60

FURTHER READING

Blattner 2006, 92–97, Carman 2003, 18–22, 207–20, Wrathall 2013b

EXTANTNESS (*VORHANDENHEIT*). SEE OCCURRENTNESS.

F

FACT (*SACHE*). SEE MATTER, THE.

82.
FACTICITY (*FAKTIZITÄT*)

Facticity is Dasein's existential determinateness. The term "facticity" first emerges in the context of Heidegger's confrontation with neo-Kantianism. While working on his dissertation (1913) and his habilitation (1915) as Heinrich Rickert's student, he distinguishes between the logic character (*Logizität*) of the timeless, absolute, and universal sphere of theoretical knowledge, and the facticity (*Faktizität*) of what is temporal, individual, and accidental. During his earliest lectures in Freiburg (1919/20), he develops several phenomenological analyses of life in its immediate givenness. For him, LIFE experiences the situations and understands the relationships of its surrounding world. "Facticity" designates that world of meaningful relationships and familiar situations in which life already encounters itself: "Factical life – in its richness of relations and meanings – is what is nearest to us" (GA58:175).

Later, in the frame of the early phenomenological interpretations of Paul's epistles and Augustine's sources (1920/21), facticity is used to refer to the primary reality of factical life experience. But the facticity of human life has nothing to do with the *factum* of knowledge, nor does it designate the *factum brutum* of something simply OCCURRENT without any kind of determination. The lecture course *Ontology – The Hermeneutics of Facticity* (1923) offers a first systematic attempt at conceptually articulating *Dasein*'s diverse factical modes of existence, and in the treatise *The Concept of Time* (1924), Heidegger uses the spelling *Facticität* in order to highlight its ontological sense. Finally, in *Being and Time* (1927) *Dasein*'s THROWNNESS (*Geworfenheit*) signals the facticity of having fallen into the anonymity of the One (*das Man*), in contrast to its projection as a horizon of possibilities. *Dasein* exists factically. To put it otherwise, "existentiality is essentially determined by facticity" (SZ 192) and, together with existence and fallenness, it is a fundamental ontological character of *Dasein* as care.

Regarding its etymology, *Faktizität* comes from the Latinized *Faktum*, which needs to be distinguished from *Tatsache*. In 1756, the theologian Joachim Spalding introduced the term *Faktum* to translate the English "matter of fact," which, in turn, is the translation of the Latin expression *res facti* (Krug 1832–38, vol. III, 5). In Kant, one can find the distinction between the *Faktum* of reason and the *Tatsache* of freedom.

For a better understanding of the term "facticity," one has to keep in mind that Dasein is always in a world in the sense of being immersed in it. As Heidegger states in many of his Marburg lectures (1924/28) and in *Being and Time*, being-in-the-world is our basic constitution. We do not just occupy a place in a system of objects, but rather live in a WORLD. To live in a world involves knowing our way around. There are also various ways in which we relate to objects (concern) and persons (solicitude) around us. We care for the objects and persons that surround us; we do not just stand indifferent to them.

Stones and trees, rivers and clouds, streets and buildings, and monuments and museums are occurrent within the world. That is a fact (*Tatsache*), and we speak of their factuality (*Tatsächlichkeit*). Dasein is also at hand in the world, but not primarily in the way that streets

and buildings, monuments and museums, and cats and dogs are. They are worldless. Dasein, on the contrary, constitutes world. As Inwood points out, for Dasein's factuality Heidegger uses the latinate *Faktizität* (Inwood 1999, 218). Facticity refers to Dasein's thrownness. Our thrownness is not just factuality, but facticity. A factical entity is faced every day with the task of being what it has already been and choosing what it can be.

Heidegger develops this thought with regard to Dasein itself. "Whenever Dasein is, it is a Fact; and the factuality of such Fact is what we shall call Dasein's '*facticity*'" (SZ 56). He draws a clear distinction between facts (*Tatsachen*) and Facts (*Faktum*). Facts are fixed aspects of things occurrent and AVAILABLE, whereas Facts are determinate aspects of Dasein. For example, it is a fact that my bike weighs sixteen pounds, but a Fact that I am a teacher. These are different ways of describing existing things. However, Heidegger sees an important ontological distinction between these two types of description: being a teacher is a way of being-in-the-world, while weighing sixteen pounds is not. Thus, the distinction between factuality and facticity shows two attitudes we can adopt toward an individual: a scientific, detached, descriptive attitude, which focuses on concrete properties of an individual (such as weight, height, and age), and an existential, ontological attitude, which focuses on the individual's ways of existing in the world.

Obviously, I am also factually determined by a certain weight. However, the fact that I understand myself as something which is occurrent like my bike, my car, or my computer disregards the existential reality of my being-in-the-world. I weigh one hundred eighty pounds as a corpse. No doubt about it. The scale does not distort the numbers. This is a factual determination. In doing so, however, I am missing the way I live and deal with this fact. I do not just weigh a certain number of pounds. I live such weight as being over or under the average according to my age and my height, or even as being indifferent to my weight. As Blattner points out, my weight – as a way of being-in-the-world – is not so much a physical property, but rather a condition that determines my existence (Blattner 1999, 45). Dasein's facticity is determined by the way of its being-in-the-world. I am what I act for the sake of being. I am a teacher, a traveler, a law-abiding citizen, and so on. Those ways of being are existential possibilities I can pursue. They are who I am, how I understand myself, even if I do not always think of myself that way. This is why Heidegger writes that "Dasein is constantly 'more' than it factually is" (SZ 145). To its facticity also belongs the ability to be "what it becomes (or alternatively, does not become)" (SZ 145). I am more than this weight or that weight; I am what I am able to be.

Jesús Adrián Escudero

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 56, 72, 135, 145, 179, 191ff., 221–22, 231, 249–50, 276, 284–85, 316, 328, 364; GA9:35/28; GA17:288–90; GA20:150, 208, 304; GA21:233, 402, 414; GA58:41 59, 61, 114, 135, 206; GA59:36, 87, 173–74; GA60:3–6, 9–14, 16, 34, 119, 121–25, 205–10, 230–31, 241–46, 259, 262, 283; GA61:2–3, 39, 79–80, 87, 117, 140, 145, 152–55, 168, 172; GA62:18, 20, 25, 27–30; GA63:3–6, 14–20, 21–33, 67–80; GA64:56

FURTHER READING

Adrian Escudero 2015, 86–96, Fabris 1997, Herrmann 2000, Lazzari 2002, Xolocotzi 2002

83.
FALLING (*VERFALLEN*)

F ALLING IS THE essential human tendency to understand and experience EXISTENCE in terms of everyday dealings. This tendency reveals itself in the IDLE TALK, CURIOSITY, and ambiguity that make up the specific DISCLOSEDNESS of the ANYONE. In falling, we are so wrapped up in everyday things and concerns that it becomes impossible to disentangle our own existence from a publicly circulating interpretation of such everyday dealings. While we cannot avoid the tendency to fall, Heidegger claims that certain experiences, such as ANXIETY, can bring us back from the fallenness in the world and point us toward an authentic mode of existence.

Heidegger discusses falling in a range of contexts, and his various claims about falling at times appear to be inconsistent. In his influential commentary on Division 1, Hubert Dreyfus points out that Heidegger confuses structural and psychological notions of falling (see Dreyfus 1991, 225ff.). With respect to the former, Heidegger says that "falling reveals an essential ontological structure of Dasein itself" (SZ 179). It is an essential and unavoidable feature of Dasein that it interprets itself in terms of the entities and possibilities that it takes up first and foremost in its everyday dealings. In addition to this structural account, however, Heidegger also explicates falling in terms of a psychological motivation to avoid experiences of anxiety and to flee one's own mortality by finding solace in the generalities of public discourse. Such fleeing and dispersion constitute a way of being in the world that is particular to some, but not all Dasein. Psychological fleeing is not essential to making sense of existence; Heidegger gives detailed descriptions of an authentic mode of existence which does not flee, and whose self-understanding is intelligible.

Another factor that contributes to the difficulties of interpreting Heidegger's notion of falling is his lack of clarity about the place of this concept in the overall structure of *Being and Time*. In Division 1 Heidegger analyzes the existential structures that make up disclosedness, i.e., the "being-in" aspect of BEING-IN-THE-WORLD. He says that "the being of disclosedness is constituted by DISPOSEDNESS, UNDERSTANDING, and DISCOURSE" (SZ 180) and he introduces falling as an "existential characteristic of the disclosedness of being-in-the-world, insofar as the latter maintains itself in everydayness in the way of being of the anyone" (SZ 167). In other words, falling does not constitute disclosure as such, but characterizes the specific disclosure of the anyone in everydayness. Later however, Heidegger says that falling *constitutes* disclosedness. Division 11 analyzes the TEMPORALITY of disclosedness. Here Heidegger announces that "this temporal interpretation must draw on the structures that constitute disclosedness. They are: understanding, disposedness, falling, and discourse" (334f.), and he devotes one section to each of these four. Due to this ambiguity regarding the status of falling in Heidegger's ontology, readers of *Being and Time* are faced with considerable difficulties in interpreting falling.

Nevertheless, the general phenomena of falling are clear, and the concept plays an obvious central role in Heidegger's existential ONTOLOGY. One important aspect of falling is that it

shows that the ontology of existence is dynamic, not static. Heidegger calls falling an "ontological concept of motion" (*ontologischer Bewegungsbegriff*, SZ 180), and emphasizes the "movement [*Bewegtheit*] of falling" (177). The trouble with the constitutive structures of disclosedness, says Heidegger, is that they give the impression that being-in-the-world is a "rigid framework, within which Dasein's possible comportments to its world run their course" (176). But this misses the existentiality of the phenomena. Dasein and world are not separate terms that stand in external relations to each other. Dasein is being-in-the-world. In comporting itself toward the world, Dasein comports itself toward itself, and in so doing constitutes, affects, and modifies itself.

The phenomena of falling illustrate this self-elaborating movement in the case of everyday, inauthentic Dasein. Heidegger claims that everyday dealings are tempting, tranquilizing, alienating, and entangling. They are tempting, insofar as we experience a constant pull to understand and articulate our possibilities in terms of the public discourse that is constituted in being with others. At the same time, falling into the public discourse is calming, or tranquilizing. The anyone, says Heidegger, "has already decided the tasks, rules, and measures . . . of being-in-the-world" (SZ 268). It does so with a kind of "decisiveness and self-certainty" (SZ 177) that obviates the need for deep and probing questioning of oneself. The anyone guarantees a "full and genuine life" (SZ 177). All the more so as it feeds a boundless curiosity toward self-discovery. Curiosity, however, acquires knowledge only for the sake of knowing, without genuine insight, and the self-discovery of the anyone therefore is not grounded in a proper examination of what it means to exist as a self in the first place. Consequently Heidegger claims that "falling being-in-the-world, which is tempting and tranquilizing, is also alienating" (SZ 178). Such alienation, in turn, leads to self-dissection, an inexhaustible attempt to interpret oneself. The terms of this self-interpretive discourse derive from the very curiosity that is driven by the self-certainty of the anyone. In other words, the movement of temptation, tranquilization, self-alienation, and self-dissection continually repeats and reinforces itself. It therefore forms a single movement that Heidegger calls a "plunge," or "whirl" (SZ 178).

Say, for example, that you have a toddler, and parenting is part of the underlying purpose that structures your existence – what Heidegger calls your "for-the-sake-of-which." In your everyday existence you deal with equipment and institutions dedicated to parenting, such as toys, food, books, daycare, etc. These show up in the context of a generic, public discourse about parenting. You are falling, insofar as you express your understanding of yourself as a parent by dealing with these everyday things within terms articulated by the public. It is tempting to go about parenting this way, because the easiest, nearest, and most obvious possibilities of parenting are the ones presented by the public. It is also tranquilizing, because in falling you find yourself responsive to, and in agreement with, public norms of good parenting. These norms are bolstered and articulated by incessant curious inquiry about, say, early intellectual development of toddlers. Such overbearing attention to "cognitive development," "reach training," or "brain health" in feeding and playing with your toddler may alienate your self-understanding as a parent, because it does not express abilities as your own, and indeed covers up authentic abilities to be yourself. Such alienation then prompts a search for your own stance on the paraphernalia of child rearing, which once again falls into the temptations of a public discourse of "holistic," "natural," or "alternative" parenting, and so on.

Heidegger's description of the movement of falling is clearly psychological. It is tempting to express oneself according to a public understanding, but one can very well resist temptation. It is

calming to note that one's values agree with public expectations, but one can seek to be risky or contrarian. The everyday entities and possibilities are psychologically nearest, and it is likely that they show up first chronologically; but the psychological dimension does not appear to be essential to the ontological structure of existing.

However, there is also a structural aspect of this phenomenology of falling, and Heidegger suggests that the movement of falling is not only chronologically but also structurally prior to authentic existence (see AUTHENTICITY). "Authentic being-yourself does not rest on an exceptional condition of the subject detached from the anyone, but is an existentiell modification of the anyone" (SZ 130). In other words, authentic existing is not removed from the public interpretations of the anyone, but a specific way of understanding and expressing the meanings that the anyone gives to everyday dealings. For example, if you resist fashionable trends and find an authentic mode of being a parent, you nevertheless elaborate and express your parenting with respect to entities and activities whose meaning is constituted in the public conception. You are still, first and foremost, engaging with everyday entities, and use and understand those entities the way one generally does. Therefore falling remains an integral part of authentic existing. It is not the mere tendency to do what everyone does, but the deeper fact that existence cannot be disentangled from everyday things and what the public says about them.

Once again, Heidegger is not particularly clear on this point. Falling is an essential structure of existence and therefore must be integral to both authentic and inauthentic existence. Nevertheless, he presents falling as an aspect of inauthenticity. "Through the interpretation of falling, what we have called the 'inauthenticity' of Dasein may now be defined more precisely" (SZ 175). To be sure, Heidegger states explicitly that he intends "no negative evaluation" of falling and that it cannot signify a "'fall' from some purer and higher 'original state'" (SZ 175–76), but this recalls his claim that inauthenticity does not signify a "'lesser' being or 'lower' degree of being" than authenticity (SZ 43). Furthermore Heidegger says that falling reveals itself in idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity, which are hallmarks of inauthenticity. On the other hand, he says that key authentic experiences, such as anxiety, take Dasein back from its falling.

To unravel this conundrum we have to focus on Heidegger's notion of being *lost* in the world. Falling means that we ply our existence in terms of everyday dealings. What hammering or parenting means is not up to us. The meanings and possibilities of such dealings are prefigured by the public interpretation. We could not get far in any pursuit, if we had to construct the possibilities that solicit us in any given situation from the ground up. Existence is not like that. Possibilities are already prefigured, and we find them soliciting us as we take a stand on them and express our own selves through them. Falling primarily means that we always already find ourselves solicited by possibilities, i.e., that we are geared into the world, or *absorbed* in it. Falling as absorption is a general, structural feature of existence, both inauthentic and authentic. There is no such thing as an un-absorbed Dasein.

However, in falling into the world and into this public understanding we can also get *lost* in it. Heidegger writes: "such absorption in … usually has the character of being lost in the publicness of the anyone. First and foremost Dasein has always already fallen into the 'world' and away from itself as authentic ability-to-be-a-self" (SZ 175). We are lost if we think that the public interpretations of everyday dealings exhaust the possibilities of being one's self. "Because absorption into the world skips over the phenomenon of world, things that occur in the world take its place. … It is the make-up of being-in-the-world itself in its everyday way of being that misses itself and covers itself up" (SZ 130). In

excessive, slavish devotion to the dominion of the anyone, we lose sight of our own ability to take a stance that makes some possibilities matter in particular ways. We fail to understand the kind of being we ourselves are and hence fail to exist authentically. What gets in the way of authenticity, here, is not *absorption*, but the *lostness* that usually accompanies absorption and produces a self-construal in terms of inner-worldly entities. Hence Heidegger turns to anxiety, death, guilt, and conscience – phenomena that break the spell of the anyone because they essentially defy a public interpretation – to sketch a phenomenology of authentic existence that is absorbed in the world, but not lost in it.

Stephan Käufer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 175–80, 184–86, 221–22, 250–55, 322, 328, 334–35, 346–49; GA20:376–91; GA24:379–88

FEAR (*FURCHT*). SEE ANXIETY.

84.
FINITUDE (*ENDLICHKEIT*)

F INITUDE INDICATES THE relationship between human EXISTENCE and BEING – specifically, the way that existence is circumscribed and limited by the horizon of meaningful possibilities given by being. In his later writings, Heidegger will call this horizon a historical *epoch* of being given by ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*). The emphasis there is on the limitation of being. In his earlier writings the emphasis is more directly on the limited character of human existence, or existential finitude, nevertheless still always thought together with the finitude of being. In *Being and Time*, for example, the horizon of possibilities is circumscribed by HERITAGE (*Erbe*), TEMPORALITY (*Zeitlichkeit*), and historicity (*Geschichtlichkeit*).

In the everyday common understanding, finitude defines the created and limited nature of human existence. Humans are said to be physically finite because they are going to die. Finitude is understood as a limitation and individual property. Finitude is also defined in juxtaposition to infinitude (*Unfindlichkeit*). Humans are finite and imperfect in relation to the divine and perfect knowledge of God. For Kant, for example, humans are finite because their knowledge is limited by experience. But for Heidegger finitude is not solely an individual property, but belongs more completely to the relationship between human existence and being, the horizon that gives meaning to human existence. Nevertheless, scholars differ on whether Heidegger only later turns to understanding human finitude in relation to the finitude of being. Many argue that in his key text, *Being and Time*, Heidegger was still caught up in a metaphysics of the subject wherein finitude was understood on the horizon of an end to individual life. But as Heidegger speaks of human existence as always already in the world (BEING-IN-THE-WORLD) and with others (BEING-WITH). Even in *Being and Time* the finitude of being was thought together with individual finitude. This is why Heidegger coins the term "Da-sein" to distinguish his notion of human existence as always already embedded in the world with others from existence understood on the order of an isolated individual subject.

In *Being and Time* Heidegger discusses finitude in light of two possible modes of human existence: authentic (*eigentliches*) and inauthentic (*uneigentlich*). These modes are fundamentally characterized by the ability to come to terms with finitude, or what Heidegger calls "being-toward-death" (*Sein zum Tode*). Inauthentic existence flees from DEATH, which it understands as an "end" to physical existence, a one-time event it hopes to eschew for as long as possible.

Yet, Heidegger states repeatedly throughout *Being and Time* that being-toward-death is not a being-toward the "end" of physical existence. Heidegger's PHENOMENOLOGY restricts his investigations to what can be known on the basis of lived experience – and physical death is not an experience we live to tell. Rather, inauthentic Da-sein does not so much flee from physical death as from the NOTHING of ANXIETY that discloses being-toward-death. In anxiety a kind of existential death signaled by the loss of all possibilities and relations to others occurs.

> As possibility, death gives Da-sein nothing to "be actualized" and nothing which it itself could be as something real. It is the possibility of the impossibility of every mode of being toward . . ., of every way of existing. (SZ 263)

This is how death is phenomenologically experienced as being-toward-death – in the impossibility of every way of existing when possibilities and relationships are robbed of meaning in anxiety. By way of this confrontation with the nothing of being-toward-death Heidegger asserts that existence moves from inauthenticity to AUTHENTICITY, or to what Heidegger calls Dasein's "ownmost ABILITY-TO-BE."

Likely Heidegger's use of the term "ownmost ability to be" in relation to authentic being-toward-death is what has led many scholars to a subjectivist interpretation of finitude that falls in line with a Sartrean brand of existentialism. On this reading Dasein is brought to an awareness of its finitude in the recognition that life is limited by death, and, as such, must be lived consciously with CARE. Jeff Malpas argues the lesson of Heidegger's account of being-toward-death is that life-possibilities are not endless but finite. Life should therefore be lived as a coherent narrative with a beginning, a middle, and an end (Malpas 1998, 134). Similarly, Julian Young states: "the practical affirmation of finitude, that is, is a life that is appropriate to the fact that we do not have unlimited time at our disposal and so must reject 'accidental' and confine ourselves to living out our central, essential life-possibilities" (Young 1998, 116). In the same vein, Taylor Carman argues to exist finitely is to resolve oneself to the "dying off" of some possibilities in the choosing of others (Carman 2003, 298).

In each of these interpretations, finitude is conceived unquestioningly with a view toward physical death. Thus the claim is that Dasein is finite because its life is going to end and Heidegger's discussion of being-toward-death is a discussion about mortality. Interpreted in terms of a person's physical death, the focus will inevitably fall on the subjectivity of a particular Dasein to the exclusion of its relations to others and the world. In such an interpretation of finitude the limitation of life by death is matched by the limitation of choices to one's own individual life. The above interpretations do not escape Heidegger's fundamental criticism of inauthentic Dasein, its leveling down of possibilities to what is present and can be decided upon by a being who, for the most part, believes that it is in control of the essentials of its own particular existence, including keeping death at bay.

But from *Being and Time* onward Heidegger rejects any attempt to reduce his thinking to a "philosophy of existence," and always maintains the interconnection between being and Dasein, even though the emphasis of his earlier work is on human existence.[1] Understood together with the finitude of being, existential finitude marks a relationship that is shaped and gives shape reciprocally to the shared horizon of possibilities. This horizon is marked by heritage (*Erbe*), temporality (*Zeitlichkeit*) and historicity (*Geschichtlichkeit*), that is, in its engagement and relationship in the world and with others. In his later writings Heidegger no longer uses the term Dasein because of the way that finitude had come to be interpreted subjectively, eliding the finitude of being. Later he will refer to the human as "lieutenant of the nothing" ("What is Metaphysics," BW 106), "the Open" ("Origin of the Work of Art," PLT 45), "Shepherd of Being" ("Letter on 'Humanism,'" BW 234), and "mortal" ("Building Dwelling Thinking," PLT 150). All of these designations are nevertheless marked by the nothing of death

---

[1] In a reference to *Being and Time* found in the *Beiträge*, Heidegger states explicitly: "as long as one accounts for this attempt as 'philosophy of existence' everything remains uncomprehended" (GA65:234).

as the bridge joining the finitude of human existence to the finitude of being. This mutually interdependent relationship between the finitude of human existence and being is more clearly asserted in Heidegger's later writings. In "The Thing" he writes: "death is the shrine of nothing. . . . As the shrine of nothing, death harbors within itself the essencing of being. As the shrine of nothing, death is the shelter of being (GA7:180/PLT 178–79). And in "Language" Heidegger states: "these mortals are capable of dying as the wandering toward death. In death the supreme concealedness of being crystallizes" (GA12:20/PLT 200).

Sharin N. Elkholy

FIRST AND FOREMOST (*ZUNÄCHST UND ZUMEIST*). SEE PROXIMALLY AND FOR THE MOST PART.

85.
FITTINGNESS (*FUG*)

Fittingness (fug) is a condition in which entities are adapted or suited to the situation in which they belong, and thus are in a suitable state for interacting with each other. Heidegger argues that entities are disclosed in their BEING when we grasp their fittingness (i.e., the conditions under which they are connected, adapted, and adjusted to each other), and thus fittingness is an ontological concept. "Fittingness" is Heidegger's translation for the Greek word *dikê* (GA40:169/171), which is more standardly translated as "custom," "usage," "order," "right," or "JUSTICE." He argues, however, that these standard translations miss the ontological significance of what ancient philosophers like Heraclitus have in mind in, for instance, fragments like the following:

> One must realize that war is shared and Conflict is Justice (*dikê*), and that all things come to pass (and are ordained) in accordance with conflict.[1]

Heidegger argues that the "conflict" or "strife" involved here is the disclosive interaction through which entities are essentially constituted (see POLEMOS). "Justice" thus should be understood, not as a moral or political condition, but as an ontological condition of being fitly or suitably or aptly adjusted to its context. "When one translates *dikê* as 'justice,' and understands justice in a juridical-moral sense," Heidegger explains, "then the word loses its fundamental metaphysical content" (GA40:169/171). He elaborates:

> Heraclitus … names *dikê* at a point where he defines something essential about being. Fragment 80 begins: *eidenai de chrê ton polemon eonta xunon kai dikê erin …* "but it is necessary to keep in view the essencing confrontation, the setting-apart-from-each-other, as bringing-together and fittingness (*Fug*) as turning-against-each-other." *Dikê*, as the fittingly adjusting structure, belongs to the setting-apart-from-each-other that turns-each-against-the-other, as which *phusis*, emerging, lets what appears shine (come to presence) and in this way essence as being.… This means that entities open up only insofar as the fittingness of being is protected and preserved. Being is as *dikê* the key to entities in their fitting structure (*Gefüge*). (GA40:175/177)

Fittingness is thus something that emerges organically from a process in which entities interact and co-determine each other through strife. If we think of justice or fittingness in this non-moral sense, then, something possesses the quality of "justice" when it is pliable or moldable – *fügsam*, in German (GA54:137).

The fittingness of entities is thus a key aspect of Heidegger's meta-ontological view, according to which being emerges through a process of mutual ADAPTATION (see EMERGENCE).

---

[1] Fragment LXXXII (Fragment 80 in Diels), in Kahn 1979, 205.

Heidegger's later work employs a whole family of terms that are etymologically related to fittingness:

> Here we understand fittingness first in the sense of joint [*Fuge*] and structure [*Gefüge*], then as arrangement [*Fügung*], as the direction that the overwhelming gives to its rule; finally, as the fittingly adjusting structure [*fügende Gefüge*], which compels fitting-in [*Einfügung*] and compliance [*Sichfügen*]. The same holds for the interpretation of *dikê* as norm. In all its domains and powers, the overwhelming, as regards its powerfulness, is fittingness [*Fug*]. Being, *phusis*, is, as rule, originary gatheredness: *logos*. Being is fittingness that fittingly adjusts and connects [*fügender Fug*]: *dikê*. (GA40:169/171)

This process of mutual adjustment that results in a condition of fittingness, however, is not a "causative intervention or effective modification of the real" – it doesn't necessarily change the material substructure of physical reality. Instead, it is "a letting be and letting withdraw into concealment" (GA52:102).

Fittingness, in other words, emerges from a process of adjustment or connection that links things into a set of constitutive relations. The "joints" or "seams" (*Fuge*) that connect things thus emerge organically or spontaneously: entities "are not simply glued together, but cut to one another, fitted into each other" (GA29/30:161–62). The result is STRUCTURE of a specific sort – a *Gefüge*, or a texture of interwoven relationships that adaptively fit one another as they constitute each other. This is the "joint-character" that "belongs to the essence of BEYNG as such" (GA42:51). Within a structure of texture, "in each case the entity is is-ing [*ist seiend*] according to the fitting arrangement [*Fügung*] of the moments that belong to the joint of beyng [*Seynsfuge*]" (GA42:214).

Heidegger's prime example of a fittingly interwoven structure is LANGUAGE. The meaning of each word in a language is a function of the semantic relationships it bears to other things – to other words and to entities in the world (see, e.g., GA33:121, GA40:185/188). The misuse of language or IDLE TALK, by contrast, obscures the fitting texture through which entities define and determine each other: "instead of opening-up being, [idle talk] is its covering-up; instead of gathering to structure [*Gefüge*] and fittingness [*Fug*], it is dispersion into unfittingness [*Unfug*]" (GA40:181/184).

Another example of the way that fittingness defines or determines entities is love – a disposition in which each entity "reciprocally fits or adjusts itself to another [*beide . . . einander fügen*], because they are at the disposal of each other [*zueinander verfügt*]" (GA11:14/WP 45). And simple daily events – like the ringing of a church bell – can establish the hours, days, holidays, and seasons in such a way that a whole life fits together, giving order and intelligibility to the temporal course of human existence (see GA13:115).

The HISTORY OF BEING or of METAPHYSICS – the history of changes in the fundamental ONTOLOGY manifested over a sequence of quite distinct epochs or WORLDS – can be thought of as a shifting in the fundamental fitted structure of entities. This shifting is produced through a process of mutual readjustment of entities. "Insofar as we do not trivialize metaphysics as a doctrine," Heidegger explains, "we experience it as the structure [*Gefüge*] of the differentiation of being and of entities that is as fittingly adjusted [*gefügte*] by being" (GA6.2:214–15/N4 182; see also GA67:51–52; GA66:335, 368). Each age has its own "principle" or "law" that governs the systematic structure or texture of entities (see GA42:112, 207), although ultimately this law

resists being captured propositionally in a philosophical system or explanation or account of being (see GA65:81).

A distinctive feature of HUMAN BEINGS is that they can take themselves out of joint with other entities in the world (GA42:249–50; GA66:386). This in turn can provoke a readjustment in the world as a whole. Heidegger argues that our current technological age is just such an ontologically transitional age, which is "coming out of joint" (GA51:36).

Fittingness need not be a metaphysical condition – that is, there need not be a single unified principle or law that governs the way entities become mutually adapted to each other. Heidegger argues that we prepare for the overcoming of metaphysics by developing in our practices a pliableness (*Fügsamkeit*) in which we as agents become adapted to adaptation (see GA66:350). The post-metaphysical process of the THING "thinging" involves the FOURFOLD "nestling into their united essence, and yet each has its own essence" (GA7:182/PLT 178). This nestling, Heidegger explains, "pliantly fits or adjusts the world" (GA7:182/PLT 178). BUILDING is the fitting or joining of SPACES (GA7:162/PLT 157). And works of ART open up a world by fitting into visible form a certain structure that, in turn, "fits together and at the same time gathers around itself the unity of those paths and relations in which birth and death, disaster and blessing, victory and disgrace, endurance and decline acquire the shape of destiny for human being" (GA5:27–28/BW 167).

Mark A. Wrathall

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

EM 122–23, 127–28, 132, 135; GA4:61/83, 179/203; GA5:42–43/31–32, 51/38, 354–63/267–74, 368–69/ 277–78; GA9:358/257, 360–61/273–74; GA11:13–14/WP 45; GA11:100; GA11:115/QCT 36–37; GA13:89; GA13:115; GA29/30:161–62; GA33:121–22; GA38:130/108; GA42:50–51, 86, 109–10, 112, 130, 142, 170, 207, 214, 249–50; GA51:36, 111–12, 115, 118–21; GA52:89, 99–103; GA54:136–37, 141–42; GA55:123, 141–48, 152–54, 157–58, 160–68, 170–72, 178; GA65:3–4, 11, 18, 59–60, 62, 65, 81–83, 510; GA66:335, 350, 368, 372–73, 382, 384–85, 386; GA67:6, 30, 51–52; GA75:93–94, 108–09, 119, 185–86, 301–03, 356, 365; GA77:156; GA79:22

86.

FOR-THE-SAKE-OF-WHICH (*UMWILLEN, WORUMWILLEN*)

A for-the-sake-of-which is an overarching project toward which all other projects are directed. That for-the-sake-of-which DASEIN exists, is Dasein itself. As Heidegger puts it, "Dasein *is for the sake of (umwillen) itself*" (GA24:428; see also SZ 84; GA24:242; GA26:243). And it is by virtue of its being for its own sake that Dasein is a self (see GA24:242; GA26:243–44; see SELFHOOD). This conception of the for-the-sake-of-which follows from Heidegger's preliminary definition of it as the "primary 'towards-which [*Wozu*]'" of Dasein's immediate, everyday involvement with entities (SZ 84).

In Dasein's immediate involvement with entities, beings are encountered as equipmental, or AVAILABLE, entities. Essential to the structure of such useful entities is their being things "in-order-to (*um-zu*) . . . " (SZ 68). That is, a piece of equipment is intrinsically *for* something, and so its way of being is characterized by "assignment or reference" (SZ 68; see REFERENCE). As referred, or assigned, the useful thing is what it is in relation to other things; it is referred beyond itself. Heidegger introduces this aspect of the available's structure by noting that a piece of equipment is necessarily among other equipmental entities. Thus, a useful thing, such as a pen, is not the writing implement that it is in isolation from other useful things, but rather along with them, thereby exhibiting "its belonging to other equipment: ink-stand, pen, ink, paper, blotting pad, table, lamp, furniture, windows, doors, room" (SZ 68). Without its relations to other available entities, the pen could not be a thing with which to write, and so is intrinsically referred to them.

The referential structure of the available is also exhibited in the useful thing's being necessarily referred to a project for which it is useful. Heidegger illustrates this with the example of a hammer (see SZ 84). The hammer is the useful thing that it is, i.e., a thing for hammering nails, insofar as the hammering is for the project of, say, fastening a board. The fastening, then, is that "toward-which" the hammer is referred. The fastening, in turn, is for the more fundamental project, or toward-which, of protection from bad weather, to which the hammer, then, is further referred. Ultimately, any available entity is referred to the most fundamental project, which is Dasein's EXISTENCE. As Heidegger puts it, the references that are constitutive of the available, are ultimately "for Dasein – that is to say, for the sake of a possibility of Dasein's being" (SZ 84). In the case of the hammer, the project of protection from bad weather is protection for Dasein. The project of Dasein's existence is ultimate insofar as it is not referred beyond itself. Dasein is not for anything further; it is the "towards-which in which there is *no* further AFFORDANCE" (SZ 84). And this project, as the ultimate toward-which of Dasein's immediate, everyday involvement with entities, is the "primary toward-which" of these affordances; it is that for whose sake Dasein exists. Hence, Heidegger's characterization of Dasein itself as that for-the-sake-of-which Dasein exists; Dasein itself is the for-the-sake-of-which.

In view of the above, Dasein is ontologically distinct from available entities in that the available, being referred beyond itself, is always for something else, for some project, while Dasein exists for itself. As existing for its own sake, Dasein is its own project; it is itself the overarching project toward which all of its other projects are directed. And it is in terms of its being its own project that the connection between Dasein's being the for-the-sake-of-which and its being a self can be seen.

Insofar as Dasein is a *project*, it exists as what Heidegger names an "ABILITY-TO-BE." That is, it exists in the mode of potentiality; specifically, the potentiality to be itself, to have the project that it is, and for the sake of which it exists, carried out (see SZ 143). And insofar as the project of being itself is Dasein's *own*, it is Dasein's to carry out. Dasein is, as Heidegger says, "delivered over" to itself (see SZ 134–35, 144), in that its way of being is to assume the project that it itself is. In this sense, the ability that Dasein is is Dasein's own – Dasein belongs to itself. Therefore, as existing for its own sake, Dasein belongs to itself, which is to say that it has itself as a project to assume. Dasein is, thus, "an issue" for itself (see SZ 84). And it is this having of oneself that is distinctive of Dasein's selfhood. In Heidegger's words, Dasein "*is* in such a way that it is in a certain way *its own*, it *has* itself" (GA24:242).

Heidegger notes philosophical precursors to his notion of the for-the-sake-of-which, such as Kant's characterization of the human being as an end in itself (GA24:242). He also asserts a close connection between the for-the-sake-of-which and the Aristotelian final cause, as well as the Platonic idea of the good (GA26:237), insofar as these Platonic and Aristotelian notions both refer to "that on account of which something is or is not, is in this way or that" (GA26:237). With this comparison, a further aspect of the Heideggerian for-the-sake-of-which appears, in the following way. Since, as we have seen, Dasein as for-the-sake-of-which is itself the over-arching project toward which all other projects are directed, such secondary projects only are what they are in relation to Dasein. Therefore, available entities, whose referential structure determines their identities by their relation to such projects, only are what they are in relation to Dasein. Dasein as for-the-sake-of-which, then, makes the available entity what it is; it is "that on account of which something . . . is in this way or that."

Mark Tanzer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 84–88, 123, 143–47, 297–98; GA9:157/121–22, 161–65/124–27; GA18:62, 82; GA20:264; GA23:100; GA24:242, 383, 418–20, 428; GA26:237–40, 243–49, 275–78; GA65:16, 302

FURTHER READING

Okrent 2007, Richardson 1963, Sheehan 2015

FORE-LEAP (*VORSPRUNG*). SEE LEAP.

87.

FORE-STRUCTURE (*VOR-STRUKTUR*)

T HE FORE-STRUCTURE is a threefold structure of fore-having, fore-sight, and fore-conception, which is involved in every interpretation. This structure is at the core of Heidegger's generalization of HERMENEUTICS from a theory of textual or historical interpretation to an ONTOLOGY of human existence in its BEING-IN-THE-WORLD. Our understanding of and ability to get around in an everyday WORLD, like our ability to understand written or spoken language, always draws on presuppositions that we bring with us and that constitute the perspective out of which we understand and interpret.

Whether we are aware of it or not, we always interpret texts on the basis of what we already understand and take for granted.

> If, when one is engaged in a particular concrete kind of interpretation, in the sense of exact textual Interpretation,[1] one likes to appeal [*beruf*] to what "stands there," then one finds that what "stands there" in the first instance is nothing other than the obvious undiscussed assumption [*Vormeinung*] of the person who does the interpreting. In an interpretive approach there lies such an assumption, as that which has been "taken for granted" ["*gesetzt*"] with the interpretation as such – that is to say, as that which has been presented in our fore-having, our fore-sight, and our fore-conception. (SZ 150)

Heidegger's move (in SZ §32) is to show not only how this applies to our understanding and interpretation of texts, but also that it characterizes our relationship to the everyday world in which we live. With this move, Heidegger consummates his attack on the traditional subject–object, epistemic model of our relationship to the world. Our fundamental relation to the world is not one of detached knowledge which can approach an ideal of being presuppositionless, rather it is one of involved UNDERSTANDING and INTERPRETATION permeated by presuppositions. Just as Heidegger denies that there is literal meaning just there to be understood independently of our presuppositions, so he claims that our relationship to the world "is never a presuppositionless apprehending something presented to us" (SZ 150).

Dasein is *already* situated or oriented by what it inconspicuously "takes for granted," that is, "pre-judgments" (*Vor-urteile*), "assumptions" (*Vormeinungen*, SZ 150), and "presuppositions" (*Voraussetzungen*, SZ 232). Heidegger uses the term "fore-structure of understanding" to capture this prior situatedness, and he analyzes it into three interrelated moments: the "fore-having" (*Vorhabe*) which is our holistic understanding of the pre-given context from out of which we interpret; the "fore-sight" (*Vorsicht*) which is the particular interests or concerns from

---

[1] "Interpretation" with a capital 'I' translates *Interpretation* (rather than *Auslegung*). In Heidegger's usage, *Interpretation* refers to interpretation conducted as technical activity of the philosopher or philologist, for example, as opposed to the interpretations (with a little 'i', translating *Auslegung*) that transpire, according to Heidegger, in Dasein's own interaction with the world, itself, and others.

the perspective of which we interpret; and the "fore-conception" (*Vorgriff*) which is the particular language and concepts by which our interpretation is framed and expressed (Lafont 2005).

This threefold fore-structure provides the substantive orientation from out of which we relate to things, others, and ourselves; it guides our unproblematic understanding as well as our activity of interpretation, which transpires normally as the result of a breakdown or disturbance in our understanding.[2]

In keeping with the overall focus of Division 1 of *Being and Time*, Heidegger explains the fore-structure and the role it plays in understanding and interpretation not in terms of linguistic understanding but in terms of our understanding and interpretation of everyday EQUIPMENT. In using any given piece of equipment, say a piece of chalk (to use one of Heidegger's pet examples), toward the end of explaining a philosophical point, I tacitly take account of the place the piece of chalk has in the "whole of AFFORDANCES," that is, I take account of the way it is related to the chalkboard, the erasers, the desks, and students in the class, the right way to write on the chalkboard so that it is legible to the students in the back of the room, the norms for comporting oneself properly in the pedagogical setting of a university classroom, and so on. I do not stop and think about or pay explicit attention to this context of interconnections. I simply "get it." This is what Heidegger calls the "fore-having." The fore-having has to do with my familiarity with the holistic *context* within which my activities unfold. Interpretation transpires always relative to such a pre-given context. An example will help.

If suddenly a student complains because he cannot read what I have written on the chalkboard, perhaps because the piece of chalk broke and, having become too small to wield properly, made me write sloppily, I have to stop, come out of the immediate and normal "understanding" flow of activity, and "work out" these taken-for-granted interconnections so as to repair the problem and get back to the task at hand. For example, I have to find the eraser, erase the sloppy writing, grab a new piece of chalk, and focus more directly on writing on the board in an appropriately legible manner. Heidegger calls this a "circumspective" (i.e., non-reflective) interpretation or explication (SZ 157) of what the chalk is *for*, and how the eraser is related to the chalk, how the chalk and the eraser are related to the practice of writing in a legible way, toward the end of explaining philosophy, for the sake of my *being* a philosophy teacher. This process involves "taking apart [*auseinanderlegen*] the 'in-order-to'" (SZ 148–49). The result is that the "in-order-to" of the chalk and its various interrelations (to the in-order-to's of the eraser, to the practice of writing on the board, etc.) which I previously simply "had in advance" (SZ150) become "expressly understood" (SZ 149; see EXPRESS).[3]

Next Heidegger discusses "fore-sight":

> when something is understood but still veiled, it becomes unveiled by an act of appropriation, and this is always done under the guidance of a point of view [*Hinsicht*], which fixes that with regard to which what is understood is to be interpreted. This fore-sight "takes the first cut" out of what has been taken into our fore-having, and it does so with a view to a definite way in which this can be interpreted. (SZ 150)

---

[2] But see Wrathall 2013b for an alternative take on the way interpretation emerges out of and is related to understanding.

[3] As the translators remind us, "to take apart," *auseinanderlegen*, is etymologically connected to the word for "interpretation," *Auslegung*, and "to interpret," *auslegen* (literally, "to lay out").

Fore-sight has to do with the particular perspective from which I understand and interpret things. It involves the particular *interests* or concerns by which I am oriented in the current situation. In the present example, my perspective and interests are those of someone attempting to explain a philosophical point in the course of teaching a class. It is in the light of this perspective, in light of my commitment to being a philosophy teacher, that I engage in the act of getting a better grip on the particular equipment with which I carry out the relevant tasks. If, for example, I notice that my mobile phone is not working or has received a call, the fact that this piece of equipment is not directly relevant to my current interests means that its place in the "whole of significance" does not at the moment need to be "unveiled" or "appropriated" in my interpretation (my response to the breakdown of the chalk). The fore-sight captures the way interpretation is interest relative, always transpiring according to a guiding particular interest or point of view.

Third, Heidegger mentions the fore-conception: "anything understood which is held in our fore-having and towards which we set our sights 'fore-sightedly', becomes conceptualizable through the interpretation" (SZ 150). To conceptualize something is to subsume it under explanatory categories, for example, of a philosophical or scientific kind. The fore-conception is the particular range of CONCEPTS that are available to make sense of what is being interpreted.

But the range of available concepts is a feature of the specific language and lexicon of the interpreter. The fore-conception captures the sense in which interpretation is *language*-relative. To put this in terms of the above example, if one of the students asked me to give a philosophical interpretation of the change the piece of chalk underwent when it went from being "usable to write on the chalkboard" to being "too short to write on the chalkboard," I could (to Heidegger's chagrin) explain the change by using concepts drawn from *substance ontology*: the piece of chalk is a substance that formerly had the properties of being "13mm long" and "useful for writing on the chalkboard," but now it has the properties of being "2mm long" and "bad for writing on the chalkboard." Interpretation is always relative to an available stock of concepts and descriptive terms. Heidegger himself seems to have such a case (of making use of ontological concepts like "occurrentness") in mind when he puts a gloss of "fore-conception" in the passage we are considering: "In such an interpretation, the way in which the entity we are interpreting is to be conceived can be drawn from the entity itself, or the interpretation can force the entity into concepts to which it is opposed in its manner of being" (SZ 150). According to Heidegger's argument in Division I of *Being and Time*, chalk as available equipment and people as Dasein are entities that are "opposed in their manner of being" to concepts characteristic of "occurrentness" (substance, accident, etc.).

Together, these three fore-structures make up Dasein's "hermeneutic Situation" (SZ 231–32) – the Situation into which Dasein is *thrown* and which guides the active *projections* and anticipations it forms in understanding and interpretation. The fore-structure operates as the taken-for-granted background against which things show up and make sense to Dasein. Despite the taken-for-granted self-evidence with which the fore-structures tend to orient us, they are not simply a fixed or brute force acting on us. In an attempt to repair a breakdown or deepen understanding, the interpreter can "get a grip on" (*ergreifen*) these antecedent structures. In piecemeal fashion, the interpreter can clarify, appropriate, and if necessary, revise them. That is precisely the work of Interpretation, and it is behind Heidegger's own hermeneutical method at work in *Being and Time* itself. Hence, in the methodological reflections that begin Division II, Heidegger refers back to his discussion of the fore-structures in order to explain why it is necessary in Division II to go

back over ("repeat") the material provisionally interpreted in Division 1 in order to arrive at "a more primordial" interpretation of Dasein's way of being (in terms of temporality).

> Ontological investigation is a possible kind of interpreting, which we have described as the working-out and appropriation of an understanding. Every interpretation has its fore-having, fore-sight, and fore-conception. If such an interpretation, as an Interpretation, becomes an explicit task for research, then, the totality of these "presuppositions" (which we call the "*hermeneutical Situation*") needs to be clarified and made secure beforehand [*einer vorgängigen Klärung und Sicherung*]. (SZ 231–32)

Attempts to deny the influence of the fore-structure and appeal to literal meaning or a world we can supposedly access independently of the fore-structures amount to "failing to recognize beforehand the essential conditions under which [interpretation] can be performed," and this prevents "the basic conditions which make interpretation possible" from being "fulfilled" (SZ 153). Accordingly, Heidegger thinks that an interpreter who properly recognizes and takes responsibility for his own involvement in and ability to get a grip on or appropriate the fore-structures will produce a more primordial interpretation, an "owned" or "authentic" (*eigentliche*) one. An authentic interpretation, to use the Heideggerian technical terms, is one whose hermeneutic situation has been actively "taken hold of" (*ergriffene*) and thereby has become more "TRANSPARENT" (*durchsichtig*).

Hence Heidegger's exhortation that the fore-structure be "genuinely taken hold of" (*in echter Weise … ergriffen*), and that this prescribes a readiness to revise or challenge our taken-for-granted fore-structures, giving us the "*constant task … never to allow our fore-having, fore-sight, and fore-conception to be presented to us by fancies and popular conceptions*" (SZ 153).

<div align="right">B. Scot Rousse</div>

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 150–53, 231–33, 316; GA17:109–12; GA18:273–76; GA20:413–17; GA63:16–17

FURTHER READING

Carman 2003, 212–15, Dreyfus 1980, Gadamer 2004, Lafont 2000, Lafont 2005, Wrathall 2013b

88.
FORGETFULNESS OF BEING
(*SEINSVERGESSENHEIT*)

T HE FORGETFULNESS OF being is our failure to recognize, respond to, and experience gratitude for being as that which grants us a place in a world of entities.

If the question of being is Heidegger's constant concern, the "forgetfulness" or "oblivion" of BEING – *Seinsvergessenheit* – is its motivation. *Being and Time* opens by quoting Plato's Eleatic Stranger "who used to think we understood [being, but has] now become perplexed," announcing Heidegger's intention to "reawaken an understanding for the SENSE of this question" (SZ 1). He later identifies "the locality of that dimension out of which *Being and Time* is experienced" as "the fundamental experience of the forgetfulness of being" (GA9:328/250). It is in search of this lost experience, or in the wake of this experience of lostness, that *Being and Time* embarks.

Forgetfulness invokes Meno's dilemma between complete knowledge of a topic, which makes inquiry superfluous, and complete ignorance of it, which makes inquiry impossible since one could not know if one found the right answer. Socrates' solution – which Heidegger credits as one of the great discoveries of the history of philosophy (GA34:267–68/190) – appeals to an epistemological state in between the two where one has a vague recollection of the answer without immediate access to it. The purpose of *Being and Time* – reminiscent of Platonic recollection, as Heidegger notes (GA58:463/326) – is to take the pre-ontological understanding we all have but "forget" and make it ontological, i.e., to articulate it explicitly.

Being is the event of entities becoming present to us in different ways, appearing to us so that we can encounter and engage with them. And yet, paradoxically, this event of appearance effaces itself. In the occurrence of entities becoming manifest to us, we bypass this most basic fact of their presence to attend to the entities. Tools and even ourselves must become inconspicuous for us to carry out our daily activities smoothly; normally, we drive far better when we're not paying attention to the car or our driving, for example. This is Heidegger's structural explanation of why we forget being, but he also sketches a historical account whereby systems of METAPHYSICS have increasingly covered over "those primordial experiences in which we achieved our first ways of determining the nature of being" (SZ 22). The purpose of the destruction proposed for the second part of *Being and Time* was to dismantle the tradition's obscuring concepts, thus allowing us to regain these direct experiences. History and hermeneutics are thereby put in the service of a PHENOMENOLOGY of the unadulterated experiences that got the history of metaphysics going in the first place but have gotten lost amidst "what stands in the lineage of that beginning, as well as the history of what is thereby necessarily left behind" (GA65:111).

His later work joins the structural and historical accounts together. The forgetfulness of being means taking for granted the primal event that any kind of entity becomes present to us in any way. Being's withdrawal is not a contingent accompaniment to the appearance of entities like a wave receding after depositing shells on the seashore, but is intrinsic to the event of being

itself. "This previous non-thinking is not an omission, but is to be thought as the consequence of the self-concealment of being. As the privation of being, the concealment of being belongs to the opening up of being" (GA14:37/OTB 29). Being is unnoticed not because it is absent, but so very present; not because it is hidden, but ubiquitous: "on account of its obviousness, being is something forgotten" (GA45:185/185). Sometimes he compares it to light: we cannot see light itself if we are to see that which it lights up (GA45:147–48/146–148, 211/209–11).

Metaphysics is less ignorant or "naive" in Husserl's sense than common sense because it moves from dealing with particular entities to examining their BEINGNESS – the universal characteristics that determine what it means to be real for a period. However, this is done without attending to the fact of their mere presence to us – being itself or ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*). "The forgottenness of being, with respect to entities: the fact that being is not thought, or else is considered (represented) merely as beingness" (GA71:292, §327).

At times, Heidegger seems to credit the pre-Socratics with an appropriate appreciation and expression for being.[1] The dynamically appearing *phusis*, and the way *a-lêtheia*'s privative "a-" refers to concealment, are far better than all later expressions, making the history of philosophy one of "escalating" oblivion (GA14:62/OTB 52). Plato marks the beginning of metaphysics, and with it the forgetfulness of being, by separating true unchanging being from fluctuating semblance. Furthermore, his definition of being as the "look" (*eidos*) of things implicitly refers to the looking subject, thus starting philosophy on the road to anthropocentrism which culminates in Descartes, Kant, and Nietzsche.

> We today, and many generations before us, have long forgotten the realm of the unconcealment of entities, although we continually take it for granted. We actually think that a being becomes accessible when an "I" as subject represents an object. As if the open region within whose openness something is made accessible *as* object *for* a subject, and accessibility itself, which can be penetrated and experienced, did not already have to reign here as well! (GA6.2:121)

We take credit for entities' appearing, philosophically in transcendental idealism or technologically in our efforts to remake the world to be maximally amenable to our desires.

Taking credit for these ideas ignores what allowed us to think this way in the first place: "we forget to ask: What is the ground that enabled modern technology to discover and set free new energies in nature" (DT 50). The mundane focus on entities and the metaphysical examination of their beingness both "forget" being by ignoring the fact that we could only be aware of the things around us or think that they can and should be organized around our preferences if being called on us to think this way. These ideas must strike us as reasonable and desirable for us to reason about, and this cannot be our doing on pain of infinite regress.

Our contemporary awareness of entities operates on the forgetfulness of being. However, although Heidegger often sounds like he's scolding us, he insists that he isn't. As with Dasein's inauthenticity, what sounds like a condemnation is actually the description of an essential moment of our existence: "this destiny does not rest upon a mere failure of human thinking" (GA9:328–29/250). Indeed, blaming ourselves for it commits ontological hubris, perpetuating

---

[1] As John D. Caputo has pointed out, there is a tension – if not an outright contradiction – between thinking of forgetfulness as necessary because intrinsic to being and crediting a particular epoch with getting being right, which he calls the myth of being (see Caputo 1993).

this very forgetfulness. Thinking that we have control over being – whether to create it, remake it as we wish, or forget it – forgets where these thoughts and actions come from. By its very nature, being conceals itself, withdrawing from thinking and drawing us into forgetfulness. The idea that we can simply start thinking it not only implies that our relationship to being is under our control, but also that being can be thought directly, that we can draw being out of its concealment into full light.

But this idea too is oblivious to being. It presents being as *a* being (onto-theology) that can be viewed and grasped in its entirety whereas being is simultaneously unconcealment and concealment; you cannot have the first without the second. In this sense, the only way to recover being is to keep it partially covered, to acknowledge its essential elusiveness the way artworks bring out EARTH in "The Origin of the Work of Art." "Thus there is put to the thinking of being the task of thinking being in such a way that oblivion essentially belongs to it" (GA14:37/OTB 29). This is why Heidegger frequently talks about preserving mystery and maintaining questions instead of turning to answers that settle matters. Being, like Dasein, is in its very being unsettled, ceaselessly at issue. To attempt to uncover it completely would cover it over.

Heidegger often equates the forgetfulness of being with NIHILISM, hardly a self-evident connection. Why would ignoring such an abstract topic as being rob our lives of value? Well, first, being is not abstract for Heidegger – it is the air our thinking breathes in; it is the fact that we can think or experience anything at all; it is with us and in us and around us at every waking moment (and not just those). To pass over this event is to ignore the most simple, most miraculous event in the history of history. If there is an ethics in the later work, it is one of cultivating wondrous gratitude for our ability to feel grateful, or anything at all. This is not gratitude *to* anything or anyone, but simply *for* our inclusion in the adventure of awareness. The universe could have transpired wholly in the dark without any awareness of itself, but instead a clearing opened up in our tiny corner of this vast reality, a clearing in which entities as a whole can appear and be seen. Taking this for granted is the original sin in later Heidegger's thought.

The forgetfulness of being also leads to nihilism by creating a kind of ontological narcissism. We take being for granted, that is, we ignore the fact that being has been *granted to* us, that we have been *given* the givenness of the world. We either don't think about this simplest possible fact or we take credit for it in the modern epoch's accelerated forgetfulness. We think ourselves responsible for all meaning and worth in the world, but Heidegger holds that finite creatures like us, thrown into an existence we cannot fathom toward an end we cannot escape, are incapable of giving genuine weight to our lives. Any positing of values on our part has no basis or validity in anything beyond us; we fall into the anthropocentric analog of the arbitrariness of divine command theory that Socrates pointed out to Euthyphro. There can be no reason to pick the particular values we do without our choices merely conforming to pre-existing values and hence not truly choosing. This autonomy, however, turns our desires into just wanting what we want with no possible justification.

> By disavowing itself in and for forgottenness, the MYSTERY leaves historical man in the sphere of what is readily available to him, leaves him to his own resources. Thus left, humanity replenishes its "world" on the basis of the latest needs and aims, and fills out that world by means of proposing and planning. From these man then takes his standards, forgetting being as a whole. He persists in them and continually supplies himself with new standards, yet without considering either the ground for taking up standards or the essence of what gives the standard. . . . The inordinate

> forgetfulness of humanity persists in securing itself by means of what is readily available and always accessible. . . . Dasein . . . holds fast to what is offered by entities, as if they were open of and in themselves. (GA9:195–96/BW 132)

The culmination of modern metaphysics, Nietzsche's will to power, collapses into the will-to-will, i.e., the will to have things the way I will them just because I do so. This eternal relapse into pure circular voluntarism is perfectly empty: there is no ground under it and nothing inside it, and this completes nihilism.

A meaningful life can only be had by putting roots into a ground that can support and sustain us. This happens culturally and historically for Heidegger, and it is a matter of recollecting that we stand on a ground not of our making, living a life not of our conception. This turns us toward the source of our understandings, and twists free of the history of metaphysics we have been trapped in for so long. "Metaphysics is the history of the formations of being. . . . Metaphysics is the oblivion of being, and that means the history of the concealment and withdrawal of that which gives being. The entry of thinking into adaptation [*Ereignis*] is thus equivalent to the end of this withdrawal's history" (GA14:50/OTB 41).

Lee Braver

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 1–4; GA40:139/138; GA45:170–71; GA65:101–02; GA66:90, 109

89.
FORMAL INDICATION (*ANZEIGE, ANZEIGEN*)

A FORMAL INDICATION is a term or expression that finds its ultimate actualization only in the speaker's very own temporal-historical situation.

It was common knowledge among the early students of both Husserl and Heidegger that the *First Logical Investigation* was the proximate source of the term "formal indication." Here, Husserl distinguishes between expressive and indicative signs, where the expressive sign carries a fixed ideal meaning and the indicative sign, especially as it is used in what Husserl called "occasional" expressions like "I-here-now" and *es gibt* ("There it is!"), shifts in meaning in accord with its context or occasion of usage. These meaning-shifters are then made subject to reiterated reinterpretation in the context of a hermeneutics of factic life experience. MEANING in this context is constituted dynamically as a telic direction, "the toward-which of the primary projection," interacting upon the precedent context of a meaningful world (SZ 151).

What exactly is being formally indicated? Heidegger at first called it the situational I and historical I (GA56/57:205–06/173–74) or, taken together, the historically situated I, which would soon be designated more ontologically as Da-sein, the limit situation of simply finding oneself situated in existence willy-nilly, not of one's own accord. DASEIN ordinarily means "existence," but in its etymological breakdown means "being-(t)here," accordingly conveying the sense of being-situated in existence. More concretely, it points to the fact, or FACTICITY, that each of us has been born into a historical-linguistic community of a historical people and into a particular generation of that people. Da-sein: at once a primal existential situation and the historical situation unique to an individual or a community.

Responsibly taking over this unique historical situation as our very own, retrieving, re-viewing, re-vising, and so reinterpreting the possibilities latent in our heritage regarded as still relevant for our own time, being responsive to the solicitations and demands exacted by that temporally particular situation: all of these hermeneutic acts of enowning come together in the proto-action (*Urhandlung*) of proper historicality, which resolutely recapitulates the movement of the thrown projection that is our originary TEMPORALITY in its ownness and finite wholeness, from future to having-been to the present holistic moment of decision, where it can be said that "I myself am my time, We ourselves are our history" (SZ 384–86). Resorting to the indexical personal pronouns brings us back to the formally indicative concept, which, as already noted, finds its ultimate actualization only in one's very own temporal-historical situation.

The course of WS 1929–30 gives us Heidegger's very last and most definitive treatment of formal indication: In contrast to scientific concepts, all philosophical concepts are formally indicative. "The meaning-content of these concepts does not directly intend or express what they refer to, but only gives an indication, a pointer to the fact that anyone seeking to understand is called upon by this conceptual context to *actualize* a transformation of themselves into the Dasein within themselves" (GA29/30:430; cf. also 428). Because such concepts –

Heidegger's terse examples are "DEATH, resolute openness, HISTORY, EXISTENCE," in short, life's limit situations! – can only convey the call for such a transformation to us without being able to bring about this transformation themselves, they are but *indicative* concepts. They in each instance point to Dasein itself, which in each instantiation is my (your, our) Da-sein, as the locus and potential agent of this transformation. "Because in this indication they in each instance point to a *concretion of the individual Dasein* in humans, yet never bring the content of this concretion with them, such concepts are *formally indicative*" (GA29/30:429, my emphasis). But when concepts are generic and abstract rather than proper to the concrete occasion in terms of which they are to be interpreted, "the interpretation is deprived of all its autochthonous power, since whoever seeks to understand would not then be heeding the directive that resides in every philosophical concept" (GA29/30:431). Yet the kind of interpreting that seeks out its very own facticity in each instance is not "some additional, so-called ethical application of what is conceptualized, but . . . a prior opening up of the dimension of what is to be comprehended" (GA29/30:428f.), namely, the "concretion of [each] individual Dasein," its proper selfhood. The concepts and questions of philosophizing are in a class of their own, in contrast to science. These conceptual questions serve the task of philosophy: not to describe or explain man and his world, "*but to evoke the Dasein in humans*" (GA29/30:258). Accordingly, philosophy is not a science but a directive exhortative protreptic, whose concepts are not generic and common, applicable to *all* indiscriminately and uniformly, but rather hermeneutically distributive and proper, applicable to *each* individually in accord with the unique temporal context in which each individual is situated. The same point is made in SZ in the distinction between categories and existentials, between the What-question and the Who-question, between the common anyone-self and the proper self of a unique one-time-only lifetime. "*All* men are mortal" is generic and common, stating a neutral scientific fact, while "*each* of us must die our own death" is herme-neutically distributive and individuating, singling out each to come to terms with their very own facticity of being-t/here.

These formally indicative, properly philosophical concepts thus only evoke the Da-sein in human being, but do not actually bring it about. There is something penultimate about philosophizing. Its questioning brings us to the very brink of the possibility of Dasein, just short of "restoring to Dasein its *actuality*, that is, its *existence*" (GA29/30:257). There is a very fine line between philosophizing and actualizing over which the human being cannot merely slip across, but rather must overleap in order to dislodge its Dasein. "Only individual action itself can dislodge us from this brink of possibility into actuality, and this is the moment of decision and of holistic insight [into the concrete situation of action and be-ing]" (GA29/30:257). It is the proto-action of resolute openness to one's own concretely unique situation of be-ing, of letting it be, in each instantiation concretely re-enacted in accord with one's own unique situation and particular while (*Je-weiligkeit*) of history which authenticates our existence and properizes our philosophizing. It is in such originary action, repeatedly re-enacted from one generation to the next, that ontology finds its ontic founding. Just as Aristotle (and so the metaphysical tradition) founded his *prote philosophia* in *theologia*, so Heidegger now founds his fundamental ontology in "something ontic – the Dasein" (GA24:26/19).

Theodore Kisiel

90.
FOURFOLD (*GEVIERT*)

THE FOURFOLD IS the nexus of four mutually adapting and reciprocally sustaining dimensions – the EARTH, the sky, mortals, and the divinities (*die Göttlichen* – more literally, "the god-like ones"). When the four dimensions are well adapted to each other, so that they are joined or "married" or integrated into a simple "onefold," the fourfold is the worlding of a WORLD:

> out of the fourfold, the onefold of the four is married. We call the adapting mirror-play of the onefold of earth and sky, divinities and morals, "the world." The world essences by worlding. (GA7:181/PLT 177)

A world (in Heidegger's later work) is a local and particular way in which entities show up as mattering and making coherent sense. The thesis of the fourfold is that the world "essences" – that is, it acquires a unified, coherent style for organizing entities – by arriving at a mutually well-adapted configuration of the four into a unity, a single integrated fourfold. The specific form of ADAPTATION of the four dimensions to one another is sustained by a special class of THINGS, things that *embody* the specific coherence of the locally prevailing earth, sky, human practices, and sacred or divine claims. Humans come to dwell in a world by becoming familiar and at home with the things that embody the fourfold (see DWELLING).

Heidegger draws the fourfold schema from his reading of Hölderlin's poetry (see, e.g., "Wozu Dichter?" in GA5, and "Hölderlins Erde und Himmel" in GA4). Heidegger sees in the fourfold a *non-metaphysical* account of the BEING of entities – that is, that which determines what is, what it means, and how it matters and makes sense. Consequently, it is a mistake to try to read the four dimensions of the fourfold as if they are metaphysical principles or suprasensous ideas or forms. The four regions are not abstract ontological conditions or postulates – they are the actual dimensions we encounter in our worldly existence. At the same time, an equally mistaken approach would be to interpret the earth, sky, and mortals as mere physical entities (there's less of a temptation, of course, to treat divinities as something constituted by the laws of physics). The four each have their own sense and impose their own claims on us and each other. They aren't collections of mere entities; they are dimensions of significance and importance.

The four are dimensions with which we are already familiar in our everyday lives. The earth *is* the earth beneath our feet, the earth that spreads out all around us as mountains and in trees, in rivers, and streams. The sky *is* the sky above our heads, the stars and constellations, the sun and the moon, the shifting weather that brings the changing seasons. We *are* the mortals – we and our companions – living our lives and dying our deaths. And the divinities (the most elusive members of the fourfold in this secular age) *are* holy beings that draw us out of our mundane concerns and call us to respond to the sacred – they are the "beckoning messengers of the Godhead" (GA7:151, 180/PLT 147, 176). Each of the four have significance for each of the other dimensions. So the earth includes the flora and fauna, the terrain and geography of a place – but these are bound together into a functioning ecosystem which has significance

for the human practices, the times and seasons, and the appearance of divine grace. The sky includes the temporal cycles (including the movements of celestial bodies), weather patterns, and seasonal variations of a place – but these as they affect the flora, fauna, and terrain of the earth, the human practices of indigenous groups, and the sacred hours, days, and holy calendar of the manifestations of the divine. The mortal includes all aspects of human activity – the culture, social practices and institutions, economic systems, forms of worship, and so on – as these affect and are affected by the earth, sky and divinities. "Mirroring" or "reflecting" (*Spiegeln*) is Heidegger's name for the process through which each dimension comes to be mutually adapted to the others:

> earth and sky, divinities and mortals, united to each other of their own accord, belong together by way of the simpleness of the united fourfold. Each of the four reflects in its own way the essence of the others. At the same time, each in its own way is reflected back into its own, within the simple onefold of the four. . . . None of the four insists on its own separate particularity. (GA7:180/PLT 179)

Mirroring or reflecting consists in each member of the four becoming lighted, or intelligible, in the process of reflecting the others. The sky, for instance, is only intelligible as the sky it *is* in terms of the interaction it has with the earth striving to spring forth as the earth it is (or in terms of the mortal activities it blesses or restricts). For example, the weather the sky brings is only intelligible as *inclement* weather given the fruits the earth bears (or the activities of mortals), and the earth first comes into its essence as the earth it is when "blossoming in the grace of the sky" (Heidegger 1994b, 16). The divinities only are divinities to the extent that they mirror and, mirroring, light up the other regions of the four. The implication is that Heidegger's divinities have to be beings who can condition and be conditioned by the earth, the sky, and mortals. Conversely, the "default of the gods" that characterizes our age is understood in terms of the failure of any divine being to condition us and the things around us: "the default of God means that no god any longer gathers men and things unto himself, visibly and unequivocally, and by such gathering disposes the world's history and man's sojourn in it" (GA5:269/PLT 91). Heidegger describes this process of coming to reflect one another as a kind of wrestling with each other – a tangible, concrete encounter where each constrains and alters the others. In a well-adapted nexus of the fourfold, then, each of the four will be infused by the others so that, for instance, the temporal cycles are articulated into holy days in terms of which the earth will solicit specific human activities.

As the fourfold are joined or integrated into a onefold, this constitutes the "worlding" of a world – i.e., the process through which activities and events come to belong together because they bear a coherent character or style. Heidegger describes this process as "the gathering-adapting staying of the fourfold" (GA7:176/PLT 172). Staying is a temporal notion that denotes, not the absence of all motion, but rather a pause or a hold on *some* changes in order to permit certain *other* activities. When a court issues a stay of execution, this temporarily pauses the enforcement of a judgment in order to make it possible to perform specific acts (such as filing an appeal). When Heidegger writes about the "staying of the fourfold," he means it in a similar sense: the staying holds the four in their harmoniously synched character in order to allow for the ongoing activities that characterize a particular world. In this staying, the four are gathered and able to more fully become adapted to each other.

The stabilization of the dynamic interplay between the four is effected by a special class of entities that Heidegger calls "things": "the THING stays the fourfold. The thing things world. Each thing stays the fourfold into a particular for-a-while of the simple onehood of world" (GA7:182/PLT 178). "Adapting the fourfold," Heidegger writes elsewhere, the thing "gathers the fourfold's tarrying, its while, into a particular for-a-while" (GA7:175/PLT 171). The things stabilize or "stay" the fourfold into a specific, mutually adapted configuration by embodying a particular way in which the four inform and infuse each other.

Since things "thing" by staying a particular world – a specific integration of the fourfold – one can't understand a thing without referring to the world to which it belongs. Consider Heidegger's example of the jug. Different jugs, as Heidegger notes, are determined "by the outpouring for which the jug is fitted as a jug" (GA7:174/PLT 169). The jug that Heidegger describes at greatest length is the jug used by the ancient Greeks for pouring out both libations to the gods and wine to celebrants at a feast (see GA7:174/PLT 170) – the *oinokhoē*. To appreciate how Heidegger uses this example, a little background on the practice of libation is helpful. "The libation ritual," Zaidman and Pantel note, "consisted in the pouring of part of some liquid on an altar or on the ground, while reciting a prayer" (Zaidman and Pantel 1992, 39). Burkert explains that, for the ancient Greeks, the libation "is performed whenever wine is drunk. Before drinking one's fill, a libation is poured" (Burkert 1985, 70). Zaidman and Pantel elaborate:

> Libations regularly accompanied the rituals that punctuated daily life. Hesiod, for example *(Works and Days* 724–6), evokes those performed by the pious every morning and evening. Libations also served to start off meals. . . . They were used too to mark an arrival or a departure, placing familiar actions under the protection of the gods who were thereby invoked as witnesses or helpers. . . . The ritual of libation furthermore formed part of the ceremonial of the private party known as the *sumposion* (literally a "drinking-together"). Finally, it played an important role in the solemn acts that were the direct concern of the civic community as a whole, such as the opening of an Assembly at Athens or the conclusion of treaties of peace or alliance between Greek states. (Zaidman and Pantel 1992, 38–39)

The libation thus served to connect a wide range of human practices to a recognition of the gods. In pouring the wine onto the earth, "the offerer surrenders himself to a higher will in the act of serene wastefulness. . . . [W]hat is spilled cannot be brought back. The libation is therefore the purest and highest form of renunciation" (Burkert 1985, 72) – an act that "demonstratively recognizes a higher order beyond the desire to fill one's belly" (Burkert 1985, 66). Because the human practice of libation involves *both* the satisfaction of human needs and a ritual sacrifice to the gods, "it cannot readily be said that one function is more basic than the other: a means of honoring the gods and the most basic form of human sociability, are combined in an indissoluble new unity" (Parker 2011, 136). Or, as Milette Gaifman succinctly puts the point, for the ancient Greek "piety is embedded in his drinking experience" (Gaifman 2018, 64).

Embedding piety in the experience of drinking, in Heidegger's terminology, is an instance of the mutual mirroring and adaptation of two members of the fourfold – the mortals and the divinities. But on Heidegger's analysis, the libation unites not just mortals and divinities, but also the earth and sky. In pouring out a wine offering onto the earth, and in drinking the wine, the mortal practices are informed by the significance of a particular configuration of earth and

sky: "the wedding of the sky and earth . . . tarries in the wine, which the fruit of the vine gives, in which the earth's nourishment and the sky's sun are betrothed to one another" (GA7:174/PLT 170). The characteristics of the local viticulture depend on the climate, and crucially on the way that weather patterns and soil characteristics combine to supply the grapevine with water: "the dark slumber of the earth receives the rain and dew of the sky. In the water of the well, the marriage of the sky and earth tarries" (GA7:174/PLT 170).

The jug, then, is a thing that brings together all four dimensions of meaning or significance:

> In the essence of the jug, earth and sky tarry. The gift of the pouring out is drink for mortals. It refreshes their thirst. It enlivens their leisure. It cheers up their sociability. But the jug's gift is at times also given for consecration. If the pouring is for consecration, then it does not quench a thirst. It stills and elevates the celebration of the feast. The gift of the pouring now is neither given in a tavern nor is the poured gift a drink for mortals. The outpouring is the libation poured out for the immortal gods. The gift of the outpouring as libation is the authentic gift. In giving the consecrated libation, the pouring jug essences as the giving gift. . . . Pouring out is not a mere filling and decanting. In the gift of the outpouring that is drink, mortals stay in their own way. In the gift of the outpouring that is a libation, the divinities stay in their own way, they who receive back the gift of giving as the gift of the libation. In the gift of the outpouring, mortals and divinities each tarry in their different ways. Earth and sky dwell in the gift of the outpouring. In the gift of the outpouring earth and sky, divinities and mortals dwell *together all at once*. (GA7:174/PLT 170–71)

Of course, the union of earth, sky, mortals, and divinities that prevailed in the ancient Greek world was not permanent. A stay can be lifted, and the mutual adaptation can decay. Following a world decay, certain practices might look the same in many respects but their significance will be fundamentally altered: "the pouring out, as soon as its essence atrophies, becomes a mere pouring in and pouring out, until it finally decays into the dispensing of liquor at the bar" (GA7:174–75/PLT 171). But as long as their world was worlding, the libation made salient to Greek drinkers how the four were adapted to and reflected each other. Under those conditions, the jug was a *thing* in the heightened sense: "the essence of the jug is the pure giving gathering of the simple fourfold into a tarrying. . . . We give to the essence of the jug, experienced and thought in this way, the name 'thing'" (GA7:175–76/PLT 171–72).

Another example Heidegger offers of a well-adapted fourfold is the pre-technological, agrarian world of the German peasant. This fourfold is stayed by and embodied in a different kind of thing – the Black Forest farmhouse (this example is discussed in the essay "Building Dwelling Thinking," in GA7/PLT). A BUILDING, "whenever it is in fact" a thing, "is a distinctive letting dwell" because such a building "has responded to the call of the fourfold" (GA7:162/PLT 157). Heidegger details how the Black Forest farmhouse provides a living space that is well suited to sustaining a specific form of response to the unified coherence of the local earth, sky, divinities, and mortal practices: "here the self-sufficiency of the power to let earth and heaven, divinities and mortals enter *in simple oneness* into things, ordered the house" (GA7:162/PLT 157). These farmhouses are designed for the specific terrain of the Black Forest: "it placed the farm on the wind-sheltered mountain slope looking south, among the meadows close to the spring" (GA7:162/PLT 157). It is adapted to the seasons of a northern

continental climate, with snow and low slanting sunlight in the winter, and heat in the summer: "it gave it the wide overhanging shingle roof whose proper slope bears up under the burden of snow, and which, reaching deep down, shields the chambers against the storms of the long winter nights" (GA7:162/PLT 157–58). Practices of worship were integrated into the structure of the home: "it did not forget the altar corner behind the community table" (GA7:162/PLT 158). Finally, of course, it was designed to accommodate the distinctive local human practices, involving extended families living and working side by side: "it made room in its chamber for the hallowed places of childbed and the 'tree of the dead' – for that is what they call a coffin there: the *Totenbaum* – and in this way it designed for the different generations under one roof the character of their journey through time" (GA7:162/PLT 158). Thus, the Black Forest farmhouse is an example of a thing in the heightened sense, because it "allows a site for the fourfold" (GA7:157/PLT 152) and it receives its particular order and configuration from the fourfold:

> Building takes from the fourfold the standard for all the traversing and measuring of the spaces that in each case are provided for by the places that have been founded. The buildings keep the fourfold safe. They are things that in their own way preserve the fourfold. To preserve the fourfold, to save the earth, to receive the sky, to await the divinities, to escort mortals – this fourfold preserving is the simple essence of dwelling. In this way, then, do genuine buildings give a shape to dwelling in its essence, and house this essence. (GA7:159/PLT 156)

Technological objects and devices present a clear contrast class of entities that are *not* things in the heightened sense – they do not gather and safeguard a well-adapted fourfold.[1] Technological entities are not uniquely at home in a local world, but rather are designed to be placed on call, ready to be used in a maximally unconstrained set of ways. Heidegger's example is a highway bridge, which "is inserted into the network of long-distance traffic that is calculating and moving at the greatest possible speed" (GA7:155/PLT 150). The highway bridge is maximally indifferent to the particular terrain of the earth: "now in a high arch, now in a low, the bridge overshoots river and gorge" (GA7:155/PLT 150). Although Heidegger doesn't note this, highway bridges are also maximally indifferent to the particularities of the sky – they are artificially lighted to erase the difference between day and night, and in the near future will be built to automatically melt ice and snow off their own surface (thus freeing themselves from the constraints of the weather). Finally, technological highway bridges "disguise or even push away the presence of the divinities" (GA7:155/PLT 151) because they help create in us a sense that we are in control of our own welfare. In a technological world, mortals lose sight of their mortality and "forget that they, always already on their way to the last bridge, are fundamentally seeking to transcend the customary and miserable in order to bring themselves before the salvation of the divinities" (GA7:155/PLT 150–51).

Thus, the technological world is made up not of things, but of STANDING RESERVE: "things are simple and small in number when measured by the countless objects that are everywhere of

---

[1] It is a mistake to think that every entity is a thing, or even that every entity could be a thing:

> A mere shift of attitude is powerless to bring about the advent of the thing as thing, just as nothing that stands today as an object in the distanceless can ever be simply switched over into a thing. Nor do things as things ever come about if we merely avoid objects and recollect former objects which perhaps were once on the way to becoming things and even to actually presencing as things.... Only what conjoins itself out of a world becomes a thing. (GA7:183/PLT 179)

equal indifference" (GA7:184/PLT 182). The numberless, indifferent technological objects are all collected into a massive INVENTORY or SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT(ION)ING (*Ge-Stell*). "In the inventory," Heidegger notes, "everything is set up in the constant replaceability of the same through the same" (GA79:44). No particular entity plays a specific, irreplaceable role in sustaining the technological world. Later, Heidegger suggests that we should think of the inventory as "a self-distorting adaptation of the fourfold" (GA4:153/176) – that is, a fourfold in which the four don't mutually reflect each other. In the technological "totality of the world as uniform sameness," everything is "ordered into a single design." In such a world, "the mutuality of the four 'voices of destiny' no longer rings out" (GA4:178/202).

Unlike technological resources, then, things in the heightened sense depend on an integrated nexus of the four regions in order to function. Such things make demands on us and, in the process, *condition* us, because we can only use them well, be at home with them, dwell in and amongst them, to the degree that we are ourselves adapted to that particular integration of the four. The danger of the technological age is that we are turning everything (things, earth, sky, our own mortality, divinities) into entities that cannot condition and thus cannot matter to us. The way to counteract the technological age, then, is to submit ourselves to being conditioned by the four.

Heidegger's name for living in such a way that we belong to a particular fourfold is "DWELL-ING" (see GA11:124/QCT 49). "Belonging" to the fourfold means that we look after or take care of a particular configuration of the fourfold:

> Mortals *are* in the fourfold by *dwelling*. But the basic character of dwelling is safe-guarding. Mortals dwell in the way they safeguard the fourfold in its essence. (GA7:152/PLT 148)

To safeguard each dimension of the four requires us to be conditioned by it and responsive to it – and each one will demand a different stance on our part: "the safeguarding that dwells is fourfold" (GA7:152/PLT 148).

We are conditioned by the earth when we incorporate into our practices the particular features of the environment around us. "Mortals dwell in that they save the earth," Heidegger explains, where "saving the earth" consists in not exploiting it, not mastering it, and not subjugating it (GA7:144/PLT 148). In arid regions, for instance, one way to be conditioned by the earth would be to live in harmony with the desert, rather than pushing it aside by planting grass and lawns to replicate the gardens of more fertile regions. The technology of modern irrigation and sprinkler systems allows us to push our own earth aside, to master it and subjugate it, rather than being conditioned by it (see Borgmann 1984). Human beings "only experience the adaptation of the earth in the home-coming to their land" (Heidegger 1994b, 16), that is, when we adjust our lives to the land in its *own* characteristics, not those we enforce upon it.

We are conditioned by our sky when we "receive it" – that is, when we incorporate into our practices the peculiar features of the temporal cycles of the heavens, the day and the night, the seasons and the weather. We push aside the sky when, for example, our eating habits demand food on call, out of season, or when our patterns of work, rest, and play make no allowance for the times of day and year, or recognize no holy days or festivals.

We are conditioned by our mortality when our practices acknowledge our temporal course on earth – both growth and suffering, health and disease. We push our mortality aside when we seek

immediate gratification without discipline, when we set aside our own local culture, when we try to engineer biologically and pharmacologically an end to all infirmity, including even death.

We are conditioned by the divinities when, for instance, we incorporate into our practices a recognition of holy times and holy precincts – perhaps by experiencing the earth as God's creation, or feeling a reverence for holy days or the sanctity of human life (GA5:27–28/BW 167).

To reiterate, these various stances of being conditioned by the four dimensions are integrated and sustained by our acquiring the skills to work with things that are uniquely suited to a particular world:

> But if dwelling preserves the fourfold, where does it keep the fourfold's essence? How do mortals make their dwelling such a preserving? Mortals would never be capable of it if dwelling were merely a staying on earth under the sky, before the divinities, among mortals. Rather, dwelling itself is always a staying with things. Dwelling, as preserving, keeps the fourfold in that with which mortals stay: in things. Staying with things, however, is not merely something attached to this fourfold preservation as a fifth something. On the contrary: staying with things is the only way in which the fourfold stay within the fourfold is accomplished at any time in simple unity. (GA7:153/PLT 149)

Our ability to be conditioned by the fourfold is a defining feature of human existence (GA7:151–52/PLT 156–57).

Mark A. Wrathall

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA4:153/176; GA9:411/310–11; GA11:101–02; GA12:19–21, 25–26/PLT 197–99, 202–04; GA12:202–03/OWL 107–08; GA13:177, 180; GA14:44; GA79:12–13, 17–20, 46, 48, 57, 74, 79; Heidegger 1994b

FURTHER READING

Borgmann 1984, Dreyfus and Spinosa 1997, Edwards 1997, Taylor 1992, Wrathall 2011, 69–87, Young 2002

91.
FREEDOM (*FREIHEIT*)

FREEDOM FOR HEIDEGGER operates at four distinct levels: (i) as the basic capacity to open, sustain, or structure access to entities, (ii) as an ability to take on commitments or obligations, (iii) as an ability to transcend or surpass factual conditions, and (iv) as a way of conceptualizing certain states which Heidegger valorizes. "Freedom" and its cognates are found throughout the full range of Heidegger's corpus; SZ, for example, characterizes the authentic attitude toward DEATH in terms of a "freedom which is . . . certain of itself, anxious" (SZ 266), whilst the 1956–57 seminars on Hegel and Schelling provide extensive treatment of the issue in relation to German Idealism (GA86). However, it is particularly in the late 1920s and early 1930s where, under the influence of Kant's practical philosophy, the concept takes center stage. GA26, for example, states simply that "DASEIN's TRANSCENDENCE and freedom are identical" (GA26:238). Even more striking is GA31:

> The question concerning the essence of human freedom is the fundamental question of philosophy in which is rooted even the question of BEING. (GA31:300)

Heidegger thinks of freedom in four main ways. First, he employs it as another term for the site of UNCONCEALMENT, or the CLEARING, or the open; in non-Heideggerian terms, this is, very roughly, the conditions through which entities are made manifest or accessible.

> Freedom, understood as letting entities be, is the fulfillment and consummation of the essence of TRUTH in the sense of the unconcealment [*Entbergung*] of entities. (GA9:190/146)

> Entities in any possible region can only be encountered . . . because of the freedom that sets free. Therefore the essence of freedom, in short, is the illuminating view [*Lichtblick*]. . . . Being free means understanding entities as such, which understanding first of all lets entities *as* entities *be*. (GA34:60)

> The still concealed essence of the open as the primordial self-opening is "freedom". . . . The free [*Das Freie*] is the guarantee, the sheltering place for the being of entities. The open, as the free, shelters and salvages being. (GA54:213)

One sees here the notion of freedom deployed in the same functional role across a variety of Heideggerian texts; in each case, it then enters into relations with concepts such as ALÊTHEIA, the open, and WORLD.

Second, Heidegger uses freedom to highlight the specific role of normativity, in particular recognizing and taking on commitments, in defining that openness. This trend is particularly

visible in texts such as GA26 and GA31 where he analyzes Dasein's ability to take on obligations, and to meet or fall short of normative standards such as those of logic or ethics. In these texts, Heidegger explains such capacities by appeal to freedom:

> Obligation and being governed by law in themselves presuppose freedom as the basis for their own possibility. Only what exists as free could be at all bound by an obligatory lawfulness. Freedom alone can be the source of obligation. (GA26:25)

> Only where there is freedom do we find the possibility of something being binding. (GA29/30:492)

Since Dasein's world is normatively structured, most obviously through the FOR-THE-SAKE-OF-WHICHes and their teleological chains, freedom is thus the basis for worldhood: "freedom alone can let a world prevail" (GA9:164/60).

    Third, Heidegger articulates Dasein's ability to transcend causal and other factual determinations in terms of freedom (GA31:303). His argument, effectively, is that freedom, as a fundamental condition on engagement with entities in general, is explanatorily prior to the causal powers that may or may not be exercised by any particular entity. As he puts it, "The problem of causality is a problem of freedom and not vice versa (GA31:303).

    Fourth, Heidegger uses freedom to articulate the value of authenticity and other closely related states. Whilst the previous points identify freedom as a capacity to open, sustain, or structure access to entities, the focus here is primarily on its value: talk of liberation, in particular, is employed to justify the status of authenticity. Dasein is faced with the:

> demand [*Zumutung*] that he necessarily shoulders once more his very Dasein, that he explicitly and properly take this Dasein upon himself. . . . It is *the liberation of the Dasein in man* that is at issue here. . . . The liberation of the Dasein in man is one which human beings can only ever accomplish in and for themselves from out of the ground of their essence. (GA29/30:254–55, original emphasis)

> Only he can philosophize who is already resolved to grant free dignity to Dasein in its most radical and universal-essential possibilities. . . . To be sure philosophizing – and it especially – must always proceed through a rigorous conceptual knowledge . . . but this knowledge is grasped in its genuine content only when in such knowledge the whole of existence is seized by the root after which philosophy searches – in and by *freedom*. (GA26:22)

In passages such as these, Heidegger comes close to linking a normative perfectionism with the conditions on philosophical success: authentic Dasein has fully realized or liberated its own essence, its "most radical and universal-essential possibilities" and is thus able to develop a philosophy capable of "coining the right concepts" (SZ 316).

    The final issue to be addressed concerns to whom freedom is attributed. In his early work, Heidegger switches, in line with the discussion so far, between two options: freedom is sometimes attributed to all Dasein as a necessary condition on worldhood (GA26:238), and sometimes to only those Dasein who have escaped the "snares" of the "ANYONE" (SZ 264). By

the 1930s, however, the complex reconfiguration of the role of being underway in his thought leads Heidegger to displace freedom onto it: "freedom no longer means freedom as a property of man, but man as a possibility of freedom" (GA31:135). Whether such claims are intelligible or not will depend on one's broader view of being in the "post-*Kehre*" texts.

Sacha Golob

FULFILLMENT (*VOLLZUG*). SEE ACTUALIZATION.

92.
FUNCTION (*FUNKTION*)

T HE FUNCTION OF a thing is the operation it performs, the part or role it plays in achieving an overall end or purpose: "the particular function must . . . be understood in terms of the purpose or goal" (GA1:417/BH 62). "'Function' means . . . an 'operating,' the execution of an essential unfolding" (GA6.2:293/N3 244). Functions are theoretical posits in the sense that they are not perceived directly, but rather are inferred from observing a thing in action (GA1:88).

The identification of functions is a key component of Heidegger's ONTOLOGY because something only properly belongs to the STRUCTURE OF BEING when it contributes to the performance of an ontological function. Thus, Heidegger explains, structure is "read off" a function (GA1:417/BH 62). In performing a philosophy of history, for example, Heidegger proceeds by asking: "what structure must the concept of time . . . have in order to be able to function as a concept of time corresponding to the object of this [historical] science? . . . Study the actual function of the concept of time in the historical sciences and determine its logical structure" (GA1:417–18/BH 62–63).

Identification of a thing's function is one way to determine what a thing, event, or structure is. A functional definition will differ from a definition that, for instance, focuses on the perceptual properties or brutely causal properties of a thing. Heidegger consistently defined elements in his thought in functional terms (see GA20:272). Of course, any given thing can perform a variety of different functions, relative to the particular context of inquiry. For example, Heidegger notes that the function of time in the physical sciences is "to make measurement possible" (GA1:423/BH 66). In the historical sciences, by contrast, the function of time is to provide the context of significance within which we can understand the specific meaning of a particular fact or event (see GA1:425–30/BH 67–71). The functions that Heidegger is ultimately interested in are not the levelled-down, numerically quantifiable functional relationships employed in the mathematical sciences, but the functional articulation of relationships "in which concernful CIRCUMSPECTION as such already dwells" (SZ 88; see also GA53:49).

Heidegger tended to redefine the meaning of words in terms of their "functional sense" – that is, he would apply the word to anything that performs the same function as the referent that is ordinarily picked out by the word in its colloquial sense. For Heidegger in *Being and Time* and works of that period, the ultimate ontological function is temporalizing. The structural elements of human existence or DASEIN that Heidegger focuses on are picked out and identified because they play a role in temporalizing or opening up a temporal foundation for the sense that things have (see TEMPORALITY). The function of the analysis of DEATH, for instance, is "not to present a metaphysical thesis about the essence of death," but rather to show "the radical futurity of Dasein" (GA3:283). TIME itself is understood with respect to its "'self-evident' ontological function" (SZ 18) – the "peculiar function . . . of characterizing and dividing the domains of REALITY" (GA20:8; see also GA20:191). Subsidiary ontological functions – that is, functions which for their part contribute to the temporalizing of the world – are world

disclosure, the discovery of entities, and the individuation of the self. For instance, the "strict functional sense" of discourse or *logos* – that is, discourse defined in terms of the function it performs in constituting the being of the world – is not communication, but discovery – bringing a matter to view (GA20:115; see also SZ 32–33; GA18:17, 46, 55, 60; GA19:25; GA20:370; GA21:142; GA24:256). Idle talk, conversely, has a function of discovering in the mode of covering over (GA20:377). Similarly, Heidegger offers functional definitions of falling (GA20:384), the as-structure (GA21:150); conspicuousness, obtrusiveness and obstinacy (SZ 74); anxiety (SZ 190), conscience (SZ 290), and mood (SZ 340).

The determination of functions is also a key element of Heidegger's hermeneutical method. Heidegger maintained that if one wants to understand a certain concept in the work of a philosopher, one must identify that concept's function in the philosopher's overarching system or project. Heidegger's interpretation of Jaspers, for instance, turns on identifying the "functional sense" (*Funktionssinn*) of his preconceptions (see GA9:19/17, 21/18–19).

Mark A. Wrathall

references in heidegger

GA9:19/17, 21/18–19, 66/51; GA17:295; GA18:17, 46, 55, 60; GA19:25; GA20:8, 66, 115, 195, 256, 272, 370, 377, 384; GA21:142, 150; GA24:172–73, 256, 283, 286, 289, 431; GA25:89, 292; GA53:49; GA56/57:38, 159; GA58:243, 245, 248, 259; SZ 8, 18, 32–33, 74, 88, 190, 290, 340, 369

FUNCTIONALITY (*BEWANDTNIS*). SEE AFFORDANCE.

G

93.
GATHERING (*SAMMELN, SAMMLUNG*)

Gathering is the power, enacted through and as LANGUAGE, which brings human beings, things, and natural objects into relation with one another. While authentic or poetic language gathers entities together in order to hold them in relation with one another, inauthentic language drives them apart. As a power enacted through speaking, gathering plays a central role in both Heidegger's ontology and his philosophy of language. Since gathering is not primarily a creative power, but instead a power for cultivating, it does not cause things or human beings to come to be. Instead, gathering brings things, people, and the elements of natural growth into relation with one another as a force that arranges, conjoins, and gleans in order to keep safe that which is gathered together.

"Gathering" translates the German verb *sammeln*, to gather, to collect, to accumulate, to harvest, to glean. Heidegger employs both the verb and the substantivized infinitive form *Sammeln*, the active participle *sammelnd*, as well as the substantivized participial form *das Sammelnde*, that which gathers, collects, or gleans. In the associative and creative style of writing that he develops from the 1930s onward, Heidegger also associates gathering with related cognates such as *einsammeln*, to collect or pick up, *versammeln*, to assemble or congregate, and *Sammlung*, a collection, assembly, or accumulation. Any particular use of "gathering" often resonates with traces of a number of these meanings.

Gathering is not yet a technical term in *Being and Time*. Indeed, in *Being and Time* Heidegger translates *legein*, the Greek word from which he derives his understanding of gathering, as *Sehenlassen*, letting be seen (SZ 34, 44). This translation is already somewhat unorthodox, given that *legein* is commonly translated as "to speak" and its cognate term *logos* is commonly translated as "language" and "rationality." Heidegger seeks to avoid these traditional associations. In his 1931 lecture course on Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, Heidegger begins to translate *legein* according to what he regards as its more originary meaning, drawing on another meaning of the Greek *legein* as gathering, i.e., "to harvest, to gather, to add one to the other, to include and connect one with the other" (GA33:5/3). In this transformed meaning of *legein* Heidegger defines *logos* as "the gathering power of making manifest" (GA33:7/5). In a later work Heidegger states this even more clearly: "*logos* originally means gathering" (GA77:223). Heidegger's agricultural metaphors of harvesting, gleaning, sifting through, and selecting out remains at the core of all future uses of gathering and it indicates that Heidegger regards human speech as a cultivating force that relies on the powers, capacities, and safekeeping not so much of the WORLD, but instead of the EARTH.

This new understanding of gathering developed through his engagement with Aristotle does not replace the enabling capacity for vision identified in *Being and Time*. Instead, it develops more fully the ontological implications of what it means that language enables not only vision, but also, by extension, the very possibility of MEANING as a whole. Hence Heidegger goes on to say:

> Such laying together is a laying open and laying forth (a placing alongside and presenting: *a making something accessible in a gathered and unified way*. And since such a gathering laying open and laying forth occurs above all in recounting and speaking (in trans-mitting and com-municating to others), *logos* comes to mean DISCOURSE that combines and explains. (GA33:5/3)

Language (*logos*) provides an arrangement and structure to what is encountered not only in vision, but also in bodily interaction in the world. This does not mean to say that language (*logos*) and gathering are simply synonymous, for while gathering is the essential activity of language qua speaking, not all speaking is a gathering.

If improperly employed, the human use of language can also scatter, disperse, and render asunder. The human capacity for language thus inhabits a twofold position within this structure, for the human is at once gatherer and that which is already in some form gathered: "What is said of *logos* corresponds exactly to the authentic meaning of the word 'gathering.' But just as this word denotes both 1) to gather and 2) gatheredness, *logos* here means the gathering gatheredness, that which originally gathers" (GA40:136/135).

Hence while gathering is in part a human capacity of "picking up and gathering together" (GA55:288), gathering also bears within it a more originary ontological sense that is likewise deeply rooted in Heidegger's ontology of language:

> "to collect," to gather, means: to bring various dispersed things together into a unity, and at the same time to bring the unity *forth* and hand it *over. . . . Legein* means to bring together into a unity and to bring forth this unity as gathered, i.e. above all as present; thus it means the same as to reveal what was formerly hidden, to let it be manifest in its presencing. (GA9:279/213)

Heidegger warns that this is not to simply be understood as "simply collecting together" in the sense of picking things up and arranging them, for every "proper gathering must have brought itself together" (GA55:268). Instead, what Heidegger intends to say here is that gathering, even gathering as a human capacity for collecting together, must be rooted in the self-gathering which creates the space within which human gathering occurs. This is what Heidegger refers to above as the "gathering gatheredness, that which originally gathers."

Although Heidegger describes gathering in what seems to be a sequential nature of steps in his agricultural metaphors, steps such as the plowing, sowing, tending, reaping, gleaning, and storing away of the crop, Heidegger makes it clear that gathering in the originary sense he is attempting to recover is not merely a matter of a "temporal sequence of preparations and steps of implementation" (GA55:289). Hence, gathering properly understood does not aim toward the end goal of keeping something safe, even if that does seem like the apparent end result of its efforts. Understanding gathering in this way would only be to grasp it "externally" (GA55:396). Instead, the saving power of this safekeeping that allows for the storing away of what has been gathered is more properly understood as the precondition and enabling element that precedes any process of proper gathering.

Wherever there is no safety, and, specifically, no safety to come into one's own ESSENCE, there can be only scattering, dispersal, and destruction of the essence. As a result, gathering both begins and ends with safekeeping (*wahren*, *bewahren*) and cannot occur without safekeeping, i.e., a "rescuing of what shows itself" (GA55:398). The human and non-human elements of

gathering are here brought together, that is to say gathered in advance in the preserving element of safekeeping in what Heidegger calls the "gatheredness of the historical human being" (GA55:291). Gathering in this sense is not an end or a goal, but is instead the site from out of which any setting of goals can occur. "This rescuing is a gathering, a gleaning, *legein*, namely *legein ta alēthea* – bringing the unconcealed into unconcealment" (GA55:398).

The term Heidegger employs for this prior condition is gathered together (*versammelt*), which he defines as "being gathered together in one's own essence" (GA55:288). Heidegger defines being gathered together (*versammelt*) as "being gathered together in one's own essence" (GA55:288). This ontological state of being gathered together has deeply political and ethical connotations, for, as Heidegger indicates throughout the 1930s and 1940s, unjust POWER structures, rampant and unbridled TECHNOLOGY, and the misuse of language all contribute to removing us from our own essence. Authentic, poetic language, in contrast, is mindful of this gap and seeks to attune language as an act of gathering to the prior force of gathering which characterizes the being of entities. Beyond the realm of poetry, Heidegger also demonstrates the political dimension of gathering in his 1933/34 lecture course *Being and Truth*, held during his period of open allegiance to the Nazi party: "*language is the law-giving gathering and therefore the openness of the structure of entities*" (GA36/37:116). According to this conception of language, language provides the law as a measure and the task of speaking qua gathering is to hit the mark of this measure. Hence Heidegger regards gathering as a power that arranges, but also as one that operates without violence as long as it follows the directives of *logos*. A politics that operates in contrast to these directives is a politics of scattering, dispersal, and essential destruction. At various points throughout the 1930s and 1940s Heidegger characterizes the Soviet Union, the United States, what he calls "world Jewry," and eventually even National Socialism as political structures that promote this destruction of the essence.

Gathering is a basic term in Heidegger's ontology, ethics, and philosophy of language from the 1930s onward and features most prominently in his analyses of ancient Greek philosophy in the 1930s and 1940s, but also in his manuscripts on ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*). Heidegger offers his most extensive definition of the term in his 1943 lecture course *Heraclitus*.

Adam Knowles

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Gathering (*sammeln*, v.) GA9:279/213; GA33:5/3; GA36/37:116; GA40:178–79/181; GA55:148, 178, 266–95; GA65:139, 183, 227, 320, 386, 400, 430, 459, 508; GA79:105, 142, 160
Gathering (*Sammlung*, n.) SZ 266; GA36/37: 114–16; GA40:136/135, 178–79/180–81; GA55:148; GA65:35, 61, 161, 180, 194, 197, 228, 232, 236, 234, 358, 384–85, 387, 442, 459; GA77:47, 73, 107
Gather together (*versammeln*) GA5:348/262; GA7:24/QCT 24; GA7:216/EGT 62; GA8:147/143; GA12:79–146/OWL 1–54 *passim*; GA55:178, 291–92, 374–76; GA77:243
Gathering and unconcealment GA36/37:115; GA55:398
That which gathers (*das Sammelnde*) GA12:56/OWL 179; GA40:136/135
Gathering and the people (*Volk*) GA65:97–98
Gathering as human activity GA55:285–95

FURTHER READING

Bernasconi 1985, Brogan 2005, Figal 2006, McNeill 1999, McNeill 2013a, Polt 2013, Sallis 1984

94.

GIGANTIC (*RIESIGE*)

T HE GIGANTIC IS a way of seeing people and things as calculable in advance. It is described as a striving to transform and remake them, affirming the continuous overcoming of their limits.

The concept of the gigantic belongs to Heidegger's post-1930 philosophy and is sparsely explained. In *Contributions to Philosophy*, Heidegger refers to the gigantic as:

> *that through which* the "quantitative" is transformed into its own "quality," a kind of magnitude ... grounded upon the ... invariability of "calculation" and ... rooted in a prolongation of subjective re-presentation unto the whole of entities. (GA65:441–42, my italics)

Integral to the age of MACHINATION (*Machenschaft*), or "the domination of making and what is made" (GA65:132), the gigantic names "the dominion of the quantitative," a spatiotemporal reckoning, that, in its essence, is nothing quantitative, i.e., does not belong to a category[1] and as the "being-historical" granting of calculability is not calculable. Framing all things as calculable in advance, the gigantic casts the modern world *as picture*, or "the creature of man's producing which represents and sets before ... gives the measure and draws up the guidelines for everything that is" (GA5:94/QCT 134). Moving beyond Cartesian objectification, where a rational subject decontextualizes and quantifies entities while stripping them of all their particularities, the representational thinking of the gigantic calculates even further, reducing objects to units of data to be programmed for future systematization and use.

The central representational activity of the gigantic is research, broadly construed as any ongoing activity that seeks to confirm the hypotheses of the researcher, and (mis)takes this confirmation for TRUTH. The scope of research as ceaseless activity is determined in advance by "the self-certain *subiectum* which builds everything on its own representing and producing" (GA65:441). This representing is

> bound to no limit ..., bound to no *given* and to no giveable *as limit*. There is in principle no "impossible"; one "hates" this word: everything is humanly possible, if only everything is taken into account in advance, in every aspect, and if the conditions are furnished. (GA65:136/95)

Thus, when grasped ontologically, i.e., as a "kind of magnitude" instead of derivatively, i.e., as quantity or quality, the gigantic points to the subject's incalculable (i.e., uncontrollable) drive to reduce all meaning to units of data.

---

[1] It is neither an Aristotelian category nor a (Kantian) category, i.e., a pure concept of the understanding. However, Heidegger's dual emphasis on the negation of limits and the striving for the limitless seem to target Kant's pure concepts of negation and limitation, classified under quality.

In "The Age of the World Picture" Heidegger says that modern technologies, such as airplanes and radios, bridge geographical and cultural distances but paradoxically, in this "epoch of the gigantic" (GA65:442), defined as "the relation of non-relationality" (GA65:132), real closeness remains elusive and the gigantic remains concealed (GA5:95/ QCT 135). Heidegger seems to hint at a link between the proliferation of research, the annihilation of rooted place, and the relevance of calculation to both events, but this link remains unexplained.

With its emphasis on subjective aggression and the "preponderance of the makeable and the self-making" (GA65:126), the gigantic points to the epoch(é) of machination, i.e., the subject–object "age of the world picture" dominant during the rise of Western industrialization. However, when Heidegger describes the gigantic as a "planning and calculating and adjusting and making secure," that can "shift out of the quantitative" and become "incalculable," he seems to refer to the epoch(é) of the inventory, where calculation finally collapses the rather fixed, world-defining, subject–object relationship into "the objectlessness of standing-reserve" (GA7:18/QCT 19) typical of the information age. Various forms of the gigantic, such as the placing of "the question-worthiness of being . . . totally outside of questioning" and "the boundless extending of the same by virtue of unconditioned controllability" (GA65:442/311), reveal the gigantic as a synonym for "challenging-forth" (*Herausforderung*), a central aspect of the inventory. This distinction without a difference is also evinced when he says the following:

> in the moment when planning and calculation have become gigantic . . . an entity as an entity, i.e., as object, is in the end so dissolved into controllability that the being-character of an entity disappears . . . and the ABANDONMENT OF BEING is completed. (GA65:495)

Both historical (*geschichtlich*) dispositions contain their own overcoming. Presumably, the recognition of incalculability, or "the invisible shadow" (GA5:95/QCT 135), as the withdrawn origin of the gigantic is a reference to the groundless ground, truth as the revealing-concealing structure, *a-lêtheia*, to which all historically specific disclosures of BEING, including the calculability of the gigantic and challenging-forth, are indebted. Yet, late moderns are oblivious to *a-lêtheia* and oblivious to their oblivion.

Heidegger's few reflections on the gigantic stop circa 1938. In *Contributions to Philosophy*, Heidegger notes that, ontologically, the gigantic is "the lack of distress in distress" (GA65:137; see EMERGENCY). Calculation keeps distress away, thereby covering up the essence of the gigantic "*as the unconditioned domination of representing and producing – a denial of the truth of beyng in favor of 'what belongs to reason' and what is 'given,' a denial that is not in control of itself* and, in heightened self-certainty, is simply never aware of itself" (GA65:442, my italics). It is the ignoring of the "abandonment of entities by being" (GA65:136) and the anxious refusal[2] (GA65:139) of its indebtedness to being (the incalculable). The denial enables the "quantitative domination of all entities" (GA65:137) to posit an ersatz explanation of the real with the uncritical affirmation of facts and data,

---

[2] In *Basic Questions of Philosophy: Selected "Problems" of "Logic"* Heidegger implicitly associates the gigantic and challenging-forth with terror. He writes: "the nearly unacknowledged need arising from the abandonment by being becomes compelling in the basic disposition of terror. . . . Terror, the basic disposition of the other beginning, reveals behind all progress and all domination over beings a dark emptiness of irrelevance" (GA45:197).

construed as "the given" or the truth. In some respects this problematic affirmation of objectivity is echoed in the one-dimensional, positive rationality of Western, industrial capitalism, diagnosed and trenchantly criticized by the founding members of the Frankfurt School.

Dana S. Belu

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA7:5–36/QCT 3–35; GA40:197/201; GA65:127–29,134–38, 441–44, 495; GA79:24–45, 68–77

95.
GIVENNESS (*GEGEBENHEIT*)

"Givenness" in the neutral and formal sense means "being given." The fact that something is given means that it shows itself or appears in experience. "Givenness" is also used as a technical term in Husserlian phenomenology to refer to a specific way of bringing phenomena to appearance. While Heidegger is critical of this technical use of the concept of givenness, the "giving" of entities – i.e., a non-causal allowing entities to be – is an important notion in Heidegger's later work.

Heidegger thus uses the concept of givenness and cognate notions – such as, e.g., "the given" (*das Gegebene*) and "pre-givenness" (*Vorgabe*) – in three different ways, which overlap at times. To understand givenness in the first, neutral sense, experience has to be understood in the widest sense of the word, to the effect that it includes not only perceptual experience but also memory, imagination, etc., as well as philosophical experience, that is, phenomenological analysis conducted in terms of eidetic insight. Since according to PHENOMENOLOGY all experience has an intentional character, namely, it is always experience *of* something, givenness has to be viewed in the light of INTENTIONALITY. Thus, the fact that something is given or experienced means that it is given to the experiencing subject in a certain manner. One can easily notice how close the notion of givenness is to the concepts of phenomenon (*Phänomen*) and APPEARANCE (*Erscheinung*). Heidegger himself hints at that proximity by providing, for example, the following account of phenomenon: "That some such thing, something experienced, always *somehow* gives itself (what encounters me – I myself, the I encounters me in various ways), we can also formulate in such a way that it *appears*, is a *phenomenon*" (GA58:50).

The second usage of the concept of givenness plays a central role in Heidegger's polemics against neo-Kantianism (see, e.g., GA58:132–34) and above all in his critical appropriation of Husserlian phenomenology. In his early Freiburg lectures, Heidegger recognizes the importance of the notion of givenness for phenomenology to such an extent that he asks: "What does 'given' mean? '*Givenness*'? This magic word of phenomenology and 'thorn in the side' for others" (GA58:5). Nonetheless, Heidegger does not accept the notion, or rather, the epistemological account of it, in his own project of a phenomenological hermeneutics of factical life, because, according to him, the concept of givenness is closely linked to the primacy of the theoretical attitude that he wants to overcome:

> *How do I live and experience the environmental? How* is it "given" to me? No, for something environmental to be *given* is already a theoretical infringement. It is already forcibly removed from me, from my historical "I"; the "it worlds" is already no longer primary. "Given" already signifies an inconspicuous but genuine … theoretical reflection inflicted upon the environment.… "Givenness" signifies the initial objectifying infringement of the environment, its initial placement before the *still* historical "I." (GA56/57:88–89)

Thus, according to Heidegger, the conceptuality based on givenness is not able to properly articulate the original features of factical life in that it relies on the theoretical reflection or attitude, which implies a more or less explicit tendency to objectify life by fixing it as a thing, without doing justice to its own inherent temporal and historical dynamics. In this context, his main concern is to show the extent to which an analysis of the immediate datum in theoretical or epistemological terms fails to grasp the genuine characteristics of what we experience in our everyday environment. What is actually given to our immediate and unbiased experience is not the immediate datum conceptualized by the theoretical or epistemological attitude but what is experienced within the original meaningfulness of the WORLD. Very similar critical remarks are found in *Being and Time*, where Heidegger is skeptical about the possibility of disclosing the original nature of the self in terms of an allegedly self-evident given (see especially SZ 115–16; and see SELFHOOD).

Remarkably enough, his critique of the notion of givenness does not prevent Heidegger from coining a new terminology that recalls the more formal meaning of that notion, with a view to articulating the way in which being gives or shows itself. This third use of the conceptual constellation of givenness is already present in *Being and Time* but becomes more important and consistent in Heidegger's later writings. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger writes: "Of course only as long as DASEIN *is* (that is, only as long as an understanding of being is ontically possible), 'is there' being" (SZ 212). The same formulation is used with regard to the relation between TRUTH and BEING: "being (not entities) is something which 'there is' only in so far as truth is" (SZ 230). Such use of "there is" (*es gibt*, literally "it gives"), which is meant to emphasize what Heidegger calls the difference between being (*Sein*) and entities (*Seiendes*), becomes more explicit in texts written after *Being and Time*. In the "Letter on 'Humanism,'" Heidegger explains this crucial point as follows:

> In *Being and Time* (p. 212) we purposely and cautiously say, *il y a l'Être*: "there is/it gives" ["*es gibt*"] being. *Il y a* translates "it gives" imprecisely. For the "it" that here "gives" is being itself. The "gives" names the essence of being that is giving, granting its truth. The self-giving into the open, along with the open region itself, is being itself.
>
> At the same time "it gives" is used preliminarily to avoid the locution "being is"; for "is" is commonly said of some thing that is. We call such a thing a being. But being "is" precisely not "a being." (GA9:334/254–55)

In "Time and Being" (GA14:3–30/OTB 1–24), Heidegger elaborates on this perspective by arguing that phrases such as "being is" and "time is" are not appropriate. Instead, it is more pertinent to say that "there is [*Es gibt*, 'It gives'] being" and "there is time" (GA14:23). In exploring the meaning of the "It gives" underlying the "giving" (*Geben*) specific to being and time, Heidegger traces it back to ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*), which is in the end that which "gives" being and time.

Antonio Cimino

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 115–16, 212, 230; GA9:334/254–55; GA14:3–30/OTB 1–24; GA56/57:88–89; GA58:5, 50, 132–34

FURTHER READING

Marion 1998, Marion 2002

96.
GOD OR GODS (*GOTT, GÖTTER*)

THE GOD OR gods are the ones who counter us, that is, who encounter us and compel us to be guardians of BEYNG (GA66:118). In the nearness of the gods, everything is revealed anew as we are called to a new attunement to the world.

"Only a god can still save us" (GA16:671/HR 26). Heidegger made this statement in his 1966 interview with the magazine *Der Spiegel*. Since the posthumous publication of the interview under this title in 1976, the statement has been the subject of much controversy and confusion. Yet to attentive readers of Heidegger's writings, it should have come as no surprise. In an essay penned in 1943 and published in 1952, Heidegger had written: "perhaps we will no longer pass by so quickly without hearing what is said at the beginning of the passage [from Nietzsche's *Gay Science*] that [announces the death of God]: that the madman 'cried incessantly: I seek God! I seek God!' . . . And the ear of our thinking, does it still not hear the cry?" (GA5:266–67/QCT 111–12). Even after abandoning his native Catholicism in the early 1920s, Heidegger remained to the end a god-seeker, and the question of god (*Gottesfrage*) can be said to have doggedly accompanied the question of being (*Seinsfrage*) on his entire path of thought, even though he kept it at an arm's length during the years surrounding the publication of *Being and Time* in 1927 (see Davis 2014a).

The context of the statement "only a god can still save us" in the 1966 interview is Heidegger's claim that neither philosophy, nor any other human endeavor, can on its own "effect any immediate transformation of the present condition of the world." In other words, we cannot think or will our way out of the condition of technological NIHILISM. This does not mean that we are to do nothing. Rather, he says, "I see the only possibility of salvation in the process of preparing a readiness, through thinking and poetizing, for the appearance of the god or for the absence of the god in the decline" (GA16:671/HR 326). A bit later in the interview Heidegger states: "for me, Hölderlin is the poet who points to the future, who awaits the god" (GA16:678/HR 330). By the time of the interview Heidegger had held steady to this conviction for more than twenty years. Already in the preliminary remarks to his first lecture course on Hölderlin in 1934, he had claimed that Hölderlin's "still timeless and placeless work has already ... grounded the inception of another history, a history which commences with the struggle over the decision about the arrival or flight of the god" (GA39:1).

Unlike readers in 1976, those listening to this lecture course in 1934 would have been justified in their surprise, since for more than a decade prior to that time Heidegger had worked to strictly separate philosophy from theology and indeed from any discussion of the divine (see in particular his 1927 lecture, "Phenomenology and Theology," in GA9:45–78/ 39–62). Yet even when Heidegger spoke of the inherent atheism of philosophy, as he did in the following quote from a 1922 lecture course, it was not without some ambiguity and ambivalence: "philosophy, in its radical, self-posing questionability, must be *a-theistic* as a matter of principle. Precisely on account of its basic intention, philosophy must not presume to possess or determine God. The more radical philosophy is, the

more determinately is it on a path away from God; yet, precisely in the radical actualization of the 'away,' it has its own difficult proximity to God" (GA61:197–98).

Heidegger broke with "the *system* of Catholicism" in 1919 (S 69; also BH 96), but for some years still adhered to a non-dogmatic Protestantism or "free Christianity." In lecture courses given in 1920/21 he attempted a phenomenological retrieval of "primal Christianity," as expressed in Paul's epistles and still in part in Augustine's works, by freeing it from the Greek metaphysics imposed upon it by the theological tradition (GA60). In 1927, and again in 1935, however, he not only strictly distinguished philosophy from theology, he also referred to the idea of a "Christian philosophy" as a "wooden iron" (GA9:66/53; GA40:9/8). In an autobiographical reflection composed in 1937/38, Heidegger reflects back on his "painful separation" from Protestant as well as Catholic Christianity, a departure and confrontation that he says "silently accompanied my entire path hitherto" (GA66:415–16).

Yet Heidegger's separation from Christianity seems ultimately to have stimulated, rather than abated, his philosophical interest in the divine. With the publication of the Black Notebooks, we now know that already several years prior to his first lecture course on Hölderlin in 1934, Heidegger no longer abstained from speaking about "the god" (*der Gott*) and "the gods" (*die Götter*) in the context of his philosophical thinking. In 1931 he wrote in his notebooks: "we will find the god again if we no longer lose the world and truly exist in the power of world-formation" (GA94:31). A few years later he wrote: "to bring the world into worlding as a world is: to venture the gods once more" (GA94:209).

Heidegger is not talking about imaginatively creating a new god for ourselves, for example by deifying the forces of nature or "human drives and powers" (GA66:239). Such "divinization" (*Vergötterung*) is for him simply the other side of the "loss of the gods" or "de-divinization" (*Entgötterung*) that takes place when we moderns reductively explain away the divine – a process that Heidegger sees as ironically initiated by Christianity itself, insofar as it understands God as an explanatory ground and reduces itself to a subject-centered "worldview" (GA5:76/QCT 116–17). Such de-divinization happens already when the Christian Creator God is understood as the supreme being and as the first cause (GA66:239–40). The God of metaphysics and theology, or "onto-theo-logy," is, for Heidegger, not truly divine. "Humans can neither pray nor sacrifice to this god [of philosophy]. Before the *causa sui*, humans can neither fall to their knees in awe nor can they play music and dance before this god" (GA11:77/ID 72). Heidegger's own apparently "god-less thinking," he goes on to say, "is thus perhaps closer to the divine god (*ibid.*).

Heidegger's god is not a god that we need, a god that we call on to answer our questions, so much as it is a god who needs us, a god who calls on us to play our part in the grounding of a meaningful world (GA94:448–49).

> The Greek gods ... are being itself as looking into entities.... Whereas the low-German word "*Got*" signifies, according to its Indo-European root, a being humans invoke and hence is the invoked one, the Greek names for what we call a god express something essentially different: *theos–theaôn* and *daimon–daiôn* mean the self-emergent looking-one and being as entering into entities. Here the god and the gods, already by the very name, are not seen from the standpoint of humans, as invoked by humans. (GA54:164–65)

We don't call on the gods, they call on us; "the gods can come to expression only if they themselves address [*ansprechen*] us and place us under their claim [*Anspruch*]" (GA4:40/58). "A

god is he or she who tears humans away from 'entities' and requires BEYNG as the between for itself and for humans" (GA95:25).

Beyng, as Heidegger understands it in *Contributions to Philosophy* (1936–38) and *Mindfulness* (1938–39), is required by gods as well as by humans as the "between" of their encounter. "Beyng essentially occurs as the ad-aptation [*Er-eignung*] of the gods and humans to their en-counter [*Ent-gegnung*]" (GA65:477; see ADAPTATION). "The gods do not create humans; neither do humans invent the gods. The truth of beyng decides 'on' both, not by ruling over them, but rather by appropriatively occurring between them such that they themselves first come into an en-counter" (GA66:235).

Why does Heidegger sometimes speak of "the god" (*der Gott*) and at other times of "the gods" (*die Götter*)? In *Contributions* he writes:

> to speak of the "gods" does not of course mean that a decision has been made here affirming the existence of many gods instead of one; rather it is meant to indicate the undecidedness of the being of gods, whether one or many.... To speak of "the gods" is to name the undecidedness as to whether a god, and which god, could arise once again in the most extreme need, and [if so] in what way and to what manner of human being. (GA65:437)

In notebook entries from 1947–48, Heidegger trenchantly criticizes the monopolizing exclusivity of the God of Abraham and Jesus (GA97:357), even going so far as to claim that "the modern systems of total dictatorship stem from Judeo-Christian monotheism" (GA97:438). "What if," muses Heidegger, "the divinity of god would lie in the great calm with which he recognizes the other gods?" (GA97:369). Would not a truly divine god be characterized by a "magnanimity of pure joy over those like him and their inexhaustible richness?" (GA97:409).

It is clear that Heidegger is not expecting a reappearance of the Judeo-Christian deity who bears the proper name "God" (*Gott*, without an article). The section of *Contributions* entitled "The Last God" (*Der letzte Gott*) is prefaced with the phrase: "the god wholly other than past ones and especially other than the Christian one" (GA65:403). The last god "needs beyng" as the between of its encounter with the human (GA65:408, 409, 415). The last god is not an eternal being who is fully self-sufficient and self-present unto Himself. It is not an omnipotent Creator, an omniscient overseer, or an omnibenevolent benefactor. The last god is neither being nor the highest being. Indeed, even to say that the gods "are" may be saying too much, insofar as it lies in "question whether something like being can be attributed to the gods at all without destroying everything divine" (GA65:437).

What is less than clear is what exactly is meant then by "the last god." Yet to demand exactness and clarity here is evidently at odds with the phenomenon at issue. Not only does Heidegger think we are not yet prepared for an experience of the last god, that experience itself would be a glimpse of something that inherently shows itself to us only in the mode of "passing by" (*Vorbeigehen*). Heidegger suggests that "the last god must be so named, because the decision about the gods ultimately leads under and among them and so raises to the highest the ESSENCE [*Wesen*] the uniqueness of the divine being [*Gottwesen*]" (GA65:406). The sense of "last" here is not that of the end of a sequence, but rather that of "the most extreme and most compendious decision about what is highest" (GA65:406–07). "The last god is not the end; the last god is the other beginning of the immeasurable possibilities of our history" (GA65:411). The "last" also signals an ultimate distance and indeed "the highest form of refusal [*Verweigerung*]" (GA65:416). We are brought near to this

ultimate god only by recognizing the presence of its absence, by experiencing its refusal to come to full presence. "The extreme remoteness of the last god in the refusal is a peculiar nearness" (GA65:412). The divinity of the last god is preserved insofar as it is never wholly present and available. At most we receive a beckoning "HINT" (*Wink*) through the "passing by" of the inherently self-concealing or "self-refusing god" (GA65 412).

Heidegger no longer speaks of "the last god" after the late 1930s, though on occasion he continues to hint of an ultimate sense of the divine, for example in his 1945 claim that "*logos* means the gathering toward the originally all-unifying One, whereby the One is the divine itself [*das Göttliche selbst*]" (GA77:224), and in his 1963 suggestion that, by corresponding appropriately to "the DESTINY that is Hölderlin's poetry," we may "attain to the outskirts of the locale in which the god of gods perhaps appears" (GA4:195/224). In any case, a concern with finding a way to recover and radically rethink the divine dimension of the world undoubtedly remains a core element of his thought to the end. In the 1947 "Letter on 'Humanism'" Heidegger says that a thinking of the "truth of being" is needed in order to think "THE HOLY" (*das Heilige*) as "the essential sphere of godhood [*Gottheit*], which in turn alone affords a dimension for the gods and the god" (GA9:338/258).

According to Heidegger, "Hölderlin first determines a new time." "It is a time of need because it stands in a double lack and a double not: in the no-longer of the gods who have fled and in the not-yet of the god who is coming" (GA4:47/64). In this time of godlessness, we "may not try to make [ourselves] a god by cunning, and thus eliminate by force the presumed deficiency. But [we] must also not comfort [ourselves] by merely calling on an accustomed god" (GA4:28/46). The poet must rather, in a fundamental attunement of "holy mourning," "without fear of appearing godless, . . . remain near to the god's absence, and wait long enough in this prepared nearness to the absence till out of the nearness to the absent god there is granted an originative word to name the high one" (GA4:28/46–47). In 1950, in an open letter appended to the essay "The Thing," Heidegger writes: "the default of god and the divine is absence. But absence is not nothing; rather it is precisely the presence, which must first be appropriated, of the hidden fulness and wealth of what has been and what, thus gathered, is presencing, of the divine in the world of the Greeks, in prophetic Judaism, in the preaching of Jesus. This no-longer is in itself a not-yet of the veiled arrival of its inexhaustible essence" (GA7: 185 / PLT 182).

Originally part of his 1949 Bremen lectures, which together lay out the contours of his later thought, "The Thing" is the essay in which Heidegger first develops his notion of the FOUR-FOLD (*Geviert*), consisting of earth and sky, mortals and divinities (*die Göttlichen*) (G7:165–84; see BFL 5–22). Of the fourth of these he writes in the 1951 essay "Building Dwelling Thinking": "the divinities are the hinting messengers of the godhead. Out of the holy sway of the godhead, the god appears in his presence or withdraws into his concealment. . . . Mortals dwell in that they await the divinities as divinities. In hope they hold up to the divinities what is unhoped for. They wait for hints of their coming and do not mistake the signs of their absence. They do not make their gods for themselves and do not worship idols" (GA7:151–52/PLT 147–48).

One question we are left with is how a particular divinity or god is related to a particular PEOPLE (*Volk*). When Heidegger begins to rethink divinity in the 1930s, it is, after all, explicitly tied to his rethinking of philosophy as always the philosophy of a people, and specifically in his case of the German people (see GA65:42–43). In his notebooks he writes at that time: "the gods only as those of a people: no common god for everyone, which means for no one" (GA94:214). A god, he says, "*requires* a people in order to ground beyng in the truth of entities," and "*only that* people that arises from such a necessity is [a] people" (GA94:318; see also GA95:25). The loss of

divinity, the de-divinization of a disintegrating world, happens when "a people is no longer able to celebrate its gods" (GA95: 51). When Heidegger turns to Hölderlin in 1934, it is not just to think "the flight of the gods" in general, but specifically the flight of the "gods of a people" (GA39:80). As "the poet of the Germans," Hölderlin is for Heidegger the poet who can, in dialogue with the thinker, redeem "the historical truth of our people … that it should once again venture the gods, so as in this way to create a historical world" (GA39: 219–21).

Especially in the 1930s and early 1940s, it often seems as though the Germans, as the "people of poets and thinkers" (GA77:233) – and the poet Hölderlin and thinker Heidegger in particular – are responsible for poetizing and thinking the god or gods who will save us all. After the war, however, Heidegger speaks in more general terms of the god, gods, divinities, the godhead, and the holy. In the 1947 "Letter on 'Humanism'" he writes: "German is not spoken to the world so that the world might be reformed through the German essence; rather, it is spoken to the Germans so that from a destinal belongingness to other peoples they might become world-historical along with them" (GA9:338/257). Accordingly, in the end Heidegger's thought could be understood to suggest that, while particular divinities are hinting messengers to particular peoples, each of which would have its particular historical destiny, the intrinsically hidden godhead from out of which and back toward which all these divinities hint, together with the healing dimension of the holy that enables all the historically varied appearances of the divine without being reducible to any of them, is shared by all peoples.

Bret W. Davis

FURTHER READING

Davis 2014a, Wrathall and Lambeth 2011

GOING ABOUT OR GOING AROUND (*UMGANG*). SEE COPING.

97.
GOOD (*DAS GUT*, ἈΓΑΘΟΝ, *BONUM*)

Heidegger has often been accused of indifference to the good, for reasons seemingly supported by the texts.[1] Rarely does Heidegger situate ontology on explicitly ethical terrain, and when he does – most famously, perhaps, in work on Aristotle's ethics and politics[2] – he appears to give ethical and moral issues an ontological makeover, leaving his readers to wonder whether he means to defend or to reject ethical categories. Throughout his career, Heidegger dismisses the compartmentalization of philosophy into disciplines like ethics, leaving the reader to doubt that he has anything to say about the human good. And Heidegger persistently dissociates his project from axiology and the philosophy of VALUE, which he came to associate with the subjective orientation of modern European thought, exposing Heidegger to the charge that his work is morally nihilistic. Despite an emerging consensus in the Anglophone secondary literature on Heidegger's importance for the philosophy of normativity and human agency,[3] and while a few monographs have tried to make a case for Heidegger's importance to moral philosophy,[4] we are still awaiting a comprehensive account of the role played by reflection upon the good in the development of Heidegger's views.

The good (*bonum*) makes its first important appearance in a course on Augustine, although the term remains largely undefined. SS 1921, *Augustine and Neo-Platonism* (GA60) belongs to Heidegger's early reflections on the significance of religious experience for PHENOMENOLOGY and offers an early sketch of what in *SZ* Heidegger calls the "ontic ideal" that underwrites fundamental ontology, with Augustine's *Confessions* as the primary text. Although Heidegger criticizes Troeltsch's reduction of Augustine's achievement to moral terms, centered on the *summum bonum*, his own account of what is at stake in the Augustinian texts, especially Book x of the *Confessions*, makes frequent reference to the happy life (*beata vita*) and the highest good as objects of religious consciousness and of human life more generally, as ways of thinking about what, in *SZ*, Heidegger will call "AUTHENTICITY" (*Eigentlichkeit*).[5] In this context, the good resembles what Heidegger later calls, in an admittedly formal register, the "FOR-THE-SAKE-OF-WHICH." If Heidegger objects to Augustine's way of describing the search for the good, it is not because the good is what is being sought, but because Augustine characterizes it, under Plato's influence, as eternal and unchanging, as a stable place for the soul to rest. (Heidegger already came to celebrate worry and unsettledness as marks of authentic

---

[1] Levinas's criticisms of Heidegger come readily to mind, but see also the work of Tugendhat and Habermas. As evidence that reflection upon the good plays little role in the literature, it is worth noting that Kisiel's index of subject-matter in *The Genesis of 'Being and Time'* fails to mention "good," and his indexes of Greek and Latin terms include only two references to ἀγαθὸν and five to *bonum*. The nearly comprehensive *Heidegger Concordance* includes only a handful of references to *der gute Mensch*, no references to *bonum*, and a comparatively small number of references to ἀγαθὸν.
[2] See, e.g., GA18 and GA19.   [3] The work of Crowell is exemplary, especially his most recent work: Crowell 2013.
[4] Representative texts include Olafson 1998b, Hodge 1995, and Reid 2018.
[5] See, e.g., the discussion of the *beata vita* and *curare* and the conflict of life (GA60:192–201, 205–10).

DASEIN, and as tasks for phenomenology, in the earliest extant lectures.[6]) The target, then, is a certain Neoplatonic conception of the good, and the philosophy of culture Heidegger associates with a debased conception of the Augustinian inheritance.

A few years later, in a course on Aristotle, Husserl, and the Cartesian quest for certainty (WS 1923–24), Heidegger insists that the phenomenology of cognition should yield to the "far more important stretch of research" dedicated to the ἀγαθὸν (GA17:278). Heidegger finally takes up the good at considerable length in the following semester (SS 1924), in a course devoted to Aristotle's metaphysics in relation to the Stagirite's views in ethics, politics, and rhetoric. BEING-IN-THE-WORLD and Dasein, as Heidegger translates crucial Aristotelian terms, amount to being after the good, in various forms that anticipate crucial structures in *Being and Time* (being good *for* and being good *simpliciter* – Dasein's *Worumwillen*).[7]

If there are plausible grounds to ignore Heidegger's engagement with the good in the early period, there is less reason to sideline the topic in the work after 1927. In a series of lectures and essays from 1928 to 1940, Heidegger places reflection upon the good, and its degeneration into philosophies of value, at the center of his work on Plato's legacy, the problem of transcendence, Nietzsche's metaphysics, and the very possibility of being and truth.

In SS 1928 (GA26)[8], Heidegger associates the idea of TRANSCENDENCE and being-in-the-world with what Socrates in the *Republic* called the idea of the good. What Dasein is about in its concernful dealings is enabled by the good, or a certain conception of it. If WORLD is what Dasein is *after*, as the basic "toward which" of Dasein's transcendence, any conception of what it is to inhabit world must take into account the enabling condition (the good) of our being able to take ourselves seriously and, more generally, to find ourselves open to the light, or the clearing, of world.[9] Heidegger suggests that Socrates' discussion of the idea of the good provides evidence that Plato rightly located the root of transcendence in *praxis*, beyond mere intuition; and he goes on to say that we ought to consider transcendence toward the good to be "the most primordial" form of transcendence (GA26:237).[10]

In an important course of lectures on the essence of TRUTH (WS 1931–32, GA34), Heidegger begins to associate Plato's idea of the good with the enabling conditions of being and truth themselves, beyond what we take ourselves to be doing. The good is here defined as the condition necessary for the possibility of being and its unveiling. Heidegger insists that the Platonic idea is far removed from any sort of sentimental conception of the good, but he clearly

---

[6] See, e.g., SS 1920 (GA59:173), where Heidegger identifies experience (*Erfahrung*) with being-troubled (*Bekümmertsein*).

[7] This comes out in §§10–12 (GA18:65–101).

[8] This important course of lectures deals with the problem of freedom, normativity, and the problem of grounding and reason, in a way that invites comparison with Kant's practical philosophy, which Heidegger considers in some detail in SS 1930 (GA31). It provides perhaps the clearest support for Crowell's insightful work on the problem of normativity in Heidegger's phenomenology.

[9] This comes out most clearly in §11 (GA26:203–52), but an interest in the good already shows in Heidegger's preliminary discussion of the principle of sufficient reason that opens the second part of the course, where Heidegger (criticizing Schopenhauer's rendering of the *principium sufficientis rationis seu determinationis*) accentuates the *potius quam* (rather than) and the problem of *choice* and "the best realization" of the possible (GA26:141, "beste Verwicklichung" at 142, the good made explicit at 143).

[10] See also "On the Essence of Ground" (1929) in GA9, which provides a condensed and in places revised version of the more elaborate train of thought developed in the lecture course. World, for instance, is said to be "that for the sake of which Dasein exists" (GA9:157/121). Transcendence is said to come into view in Plato's doctrine of the good "beyond even being itself" (see GA9:160/124).

recognizes the moral import of Plato's *Republic*, and grants that Socrates' proposals concerning the philosopher-king mean to regulate conduct within the Greek city-state. And in an important, culminating discussion of the good in Plato's *Republic*, Heidegger interprets apprehension of the idea of the good as the culmination of a *paideia* that aims at human freedom.[11]

When Heidegger begins to tackle the problem of nihilism, with Nietzsche as his primary interlocutor, it is Plato's idea of the good that Heidegger insists both enables Nietzsche's conception of value, and offers a way out of the modern conception of value.[12] And while the language of the good tends to drop out of Heidegger's subsequent engagement with poetry, architecture, and art more generally, attention to the details of Heidegger's work between 1921 and 1940 reveals a connection between being and the good, and reflection upon both, that students of Heidegger ought not to ignore.

<div align="right">

James D. Reid

</div>

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 39; GA6.2:198–205/N4 166–205; GA9:56/44, 226–28/173–75; GA18:37, 43, 46, 49, 50, 52, 55, 57–58, 61–63, 65–70, 75–80, 84–86, 91–94, 96–98; GA19:122–24, 165–68; GA22:105–07, 139–41; GA26:232–38; GA34:95–111; GA60:192–201, 205–10

FURTHER READING

Golob 2014, Reid 2018, Sikka 2017, Vogel 1996

---

[11] See GA34:95–116, especially §14. The train of thought sketched out in this stretch of the course should be compared with the essay of 1940 on "Plato's Doctrine of Truth," also included in *Pathmarks* (GA9).

[12] This comes out most clearly in the lecture course on European nihilism, included in GA6.2/N4.

98.
GUILT (*SCHULD*)

HEIDEGGER DEFINES GUILT in general as a condition in which an agent is the reason for a lack, and there is no adequate reason (as judged according to our shared standards for judging such things) that could justify being the reason for the lack. *Existential guilt* is a species of this more general form of guilt, and consists in being the null reason for a nullity – that is, the agent in question is responsible without adequate justification (i.e., the agent is a null reason) for a form of existence that negates or extinguishes other possible forms of existence (a nullity).

"Guilt" translates the German term *Schuld*. But depending on the context, *Schuld* could also be translated as blame, culpability, liability, responsibility, and debt or indebtedness. Thus "guilt" can but need not carry any connotations of moral or legal culpability. Heidegger, for example, glosses Aristotle's four causes as four different ways in which a product can be indebted (*verschuldet*) to something else for its production (see, e.g., GA7:12ff./QCT 7ff.). In this context, then, *Schuld* is a kind of responsibility without any sense of moral failure. Likewise, existential guilt has no connotation of blameworthiness. In addition, the notion of guilt in *Being and Time* (and works of this period) is not linked to any particular phenomenal qualities or affects – Heidegger is not interested in the *feeling* of guilt (with associated feelings of unworthiness, pain, isolation, etc.). Rather, he is interested in a certain structure or state – a state of being responsible for something.

In *Being and Time*, the discussion of guilt focuses on the family of concepts that involve forms of responsibility for something that cannot be justified. This family includes moral guilt, legal guilt, and "existential" guilt. Heidegger is particularly interested in existential guilt as opposed to moral guilt or legal guilt. That is, rather than focusing on whether one's actions can be morally or legally justified, Heidegger's primary concern is the fact that we are responsible for an EXISTENCE that can't be justified.

Before addressing existential guilt in *Being and Time*, however, Heidegger offers a definition of guilt that is "sufficiently formalized" to encompass all "those ordinary phenomena of 'guilt' that are related to concernful being with others" (SZ 284). Heidegger defines guilt in general in the following way:

> the formal concept of being guilty in the sense of having become responsible to another thus may be defined as: [1] being a reason [2] for a lack [*Mangel*] in the existence of an other, [3] indeed in such a way that this being a reason itself is determined as "lacking" or "inadequate" ["*mangelhaft*"] with respect to what it is a reason for. [4] This inadequateness is the insufficiency compared to the demand which is issued to our existing being-with other people. (SZ 282, numbers supplied)

There are four essential elements of guilt on this elegant analysis. First, I am guilty only if I am in some way a *ground* – a *reason* or *basis* – for my actions.[1] "Reason" needs to be understood

---

[1] The article is important here – I need not be "the" sole or unique reason for the lack. It is sufficient for guilt that I am a (contributing) reason for the lack in another.

here in the broadest possible sense. The German word that it translates – *Grund* – can mean a reason in the narrower sense of a proposition that explains or rationalizes. But it also can mean a foundation or basis – something, in other words, which offers support to something else. And it can mean the ground in the sense of a background against which something can emerge. Heidegger wants to keep all of these senses in play, inasmuch as each of these offers a different mode of explanation. Guilt is a matter of the role I play in an explanation of my actions, even if there are no propositionally articulable states that play a role in motivating or structuring the action.

Second, I am a reason for a *lack* in the existence of another person – that is, for someone not possessing something that they deserve or need.

A third noteworthy element of this formal definition is that I am guilty only if my reason for creating a lack is itself "lacking" – that is, there is no *adequate* or *sufficient* reason for the lack I produce in another. For instance, if I am legally entitled to deprive another of her property, and I follow all legal requirements in taking her property from her, I bear no guilt before the law with respect to her loss of property. I am the reason for a lack in another, but it is a good or adequate reason in that case (at least as far as the law is concerned).

Finally, the "goodness" – the sufficiency or adequacy – of the reason is determined *with respect to the obligations I bear to others in virtue of our shared way of being in the world*. It is at this point that the ordinary conception of guilt connects with norms and normality, for what counts as an adequate or inadequate reason for being the cause of a lack in another, on the ordinary conception, is determined by the legal or moral rules and standards for dealing with each other that govern our particular forms of shared existence.

When it comes to applying this formal definition to our *existence*, however, as opposed to our other-regarding *actions*, Heidegger modifies the formulation in certain respects. Heidegger drops the fourth element – the requirement that the sufficiency of the reason be measured according to the norms of our shared way of being with others. He offers no explanation for this change, but one can suppose that Heidegger is concerned with a kind of guilt that is independent of any particular set of social norms. The phenomenon of existential guilt points us toward the fact that there is no normative standard to which we can appeal to excuse ourselves from responsibility for who we are.

With respect to the second and third elements, Heidegger is also concerned that describing the failure of justification as a "lack" (*Mangel*) will be misleading to the extent that it suggests that what is lacking could and should be provided. There are, after all, states or conditions that are constituted by an absence which cannot and should not be corrected. To avoid any assumptions about the character of the absence that makes up existential guilt, Heidegger henceforth speaks of guilt as involving nullity or nothingness (*Nichtigkeit*) rather than a lack.

The "formally existential idea of guilt" is thus reformulated in the following way: "the being of existence means . . . being the (null) reason of a nullity" (SZ 285). In saying that existence is a "nullity," Heidegger means that every particular way of being requires a nullification of other possible ways of being. A being "exists" in Heidegger's sense when it "always understands itself . . . in terms of a possibility of itself – its possibility of being itself or not itself" (SZ 12; see EXISTENCE). These possibilities are sometimes "chosen," sometimes "stumbled into," and sometimes we find ourselves having "grown up in them already" (SZ 12). But in any case, existence is always decided in the singular and concrete: "the question of existence never gets straightened out except through existing itself" (SZ 12). Heidegger describes here

a phenomenon we are all intimately familiar with. Each of us becomes who we are by committing, more or less consciously, to some subset of a broad range of possibilities open to us. Human existence "in each case stands in one possibility or another," and that means, "it constantly is *not* another possibility, and has renounced it" (SZ 285). In my existence, I am "a being determined by a nothing" (SZ 283), because in taking up an identity and in determining who I am, I necessarily nullify at the same time other possibilities in terms of which I could interpret myself.

My reasons for nullifying possibilities in this way are themselves null because of what Heidegger calls "THROWNNESS." We are born into and shaped by a world that we do not control, saddled with traits and characteristics we do not choose. "In being a reason – that is, in existing as thrown," Heidegger argues, each person "constantly lags behind its possibilities. It is never existent before its reason, but rather in each case it is existent only from *it* and as *this* reason. Being a reason accordingly means *never* having power over one's ownmost being from the ground up" (SZ 284). The dispositions, traits, preferences, and affective responses I possess in virtue of my thrownness guide every decision I make. Thus, I am the reason for possibilities I inhabit and pursue. But I can't really justify the reason that I am. Any justification I could offer would ultimately be rooted in my thrownness – in my initial sense of what is good and bad, right or wrong, meaningful or irrelevant. And so any effort to justify my thrownness would beg the question of its legitimacy. The particular being that I am – the dispositions I have that lead me to undertake the roles I play, and the activities through which I understand myself – is thus determined by a lack of reasons.

So where ordinary guilt is being an inadequate reason for a lack in another, existential guilt is being an inadequate reason for not being a different person. In saying that existence is guilty, Heidegger is not also claiming that it is morally defective. Indeed, existential guilt is the condition under which I become an ineliminable part of any explanation for what I do. If in deciding my existence, there were always fully adequate reasons for my having the dispositions that I do, or pursuing the possibilities of existence that I do, then we could eliminate me as a reason for what I do by invoking the reasons that moved me. But if my being who I am is a necessary background to making sense of what I do, then my actions are necessarily constituted by the fact that they are *my* actions. This is precisely the outcome that Heidegger believes inauthentic people are trying to avoid. They focus on whether the action they perform has a reason judged to be adequate by the shared social standards of their community (be they legal, moral, etiquettical, and so on). In doing so, they can overlook the extent to which their actions are ultimately grounded in their being who they are – a being for which they lack adequate justification. The inauthentic take over tasks, rules, standards, etc., as already fixed and decided, in order to be "relieved of the burden of expressly choosing these possibilities" (268). Inauthenticity is motivated by a desire to avoid the anxiety and responsibility that come from being answerable for my self.

The authentic person, by contrast, sees her actions as grounded in her being a null reason for a nullity, and resolutely owns up to this structural truth of being a self: that to be a self is to be a reason for an action that necessarily figures in the explanation of that action as an action. In accepting my ineliminable and unjustifiable role in the production of my actions, I "make myself responsible in an absolute sense" (GA20:440–41). In such "reticent self-projection upon one's ownmost being guilty" (SZ 296–97) there "first arises the possibility of this or that determinate action" (GA20:440; see also AUTHENTICITY). The notion of existential guilt plays no

significant role in Heidegger's thought after the 1920s. But in several essays and lectures in the 1930s and 1940s, Heidegger meditates on Hölderlin's claim that poetry is the most innocent (*unschuldigste*) of all occupations, and on Nietzsche's views about the innocence (*Unschuld*) of becoming, and of the "whole of existence."

Mark A. Wrathall

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Schuld and ***aitia, aitios*** GA7:12/QCT 7; GA9:245–46/187–88; GA10:164/109; GA18:30; GA19:77; GA47:184; GA87:99

Guilt SZ 269, 279–97, 300–01, 305–07, 311, 317, 325, 382, 385; GA3:242; GA9:64–65/50; GA20:440–41; GA29/30:43; GA49:55, 58–59; GA60:257; GA61:88, 109

Debt SZ 242

Hölderlin and poetry as the most innocent of occupations GA4:32–35/52–53, 43–44/61–62, 72/93; GA39:33–35, 217

Nietzsche and innocence GA6.2:105, 108/N4 79, 108; GA44:78, 81–82; GA48:127, 129; GA67:103; GA87:55, 71

H

HALTING (*AUFENTHALT*). SEE SOJOURN.

HANDINESS (*ZUHANDENHEIT*). SEE AVAILABLENESS.

HERE (*DA*). SEE THERE.

99.
HERITAGE (*ERBE*)

A HERITAGE CONSISTS OF the traditional possibilities of existence that belong to a PEOPLE or culture. The concept of heritage, introduced in §74 of *Being and Time* (1927), indicates the essential traits of enduring, belonging, and dwelling as opposed to the uprootedness brought about by the ABANDONMENT OF BEING and FORGETFULNESS OF BEING. But because the concept has been linked to his controversial engagement with National Socialism, the significance of heritage for Heidegger's overall project of overcoming metaphysics has been overlooked. Yet heritage is central to Heidegger's thinking on BEING and is integral to his conceptions of TEMPORALITY (*Zeitlichkeit*) and historicity (*Geschichtlichkeit*). Against the more common meaning, Heidegger's notion of heritage does not signify a pre-given history characterized by an inescapable past passed down over generations to a particular group. Nor does heritage mark a simple or pure tie to a specific blood or soil, despite some prevailing views. Heidegger posits heritage as something that must be chosen and actively brought into being. Significantly, heritage arises from the future as much as it does from the past. It serves as the horizon of authentic (*eigentliches*) possibilities understood within the temporal structure of human existence.

> The finitude of existence just seized upon tears one back out of the endless multiplicity of possibilities offering themselves nearest by – those of comfort, shirking and taking things easy – and brings Dasein to the simplicity of its fate. This is how we designate the primordial occurrence of Dasein that lies in authentic RESOLUTENESS [*Entschlossenheit*] in which it hands itself down to itself, free for DEATH, in a possibility that it inherited yet has chosen. (SZ 384)

Indeed, heritage is at the center of Heidegger's account of authentic human existence. It is because authentic existence shows itself in the manner of temporality and FINITUDE that heritage may at all be chosen as a horizon of possibilities: "only a being that, as futural, is equiprimordially having-been" can be delivered over to its "inherited possibility" (SZ 385). Recognizing the centrality and specificity of temporality is how Dasein exists authentically as being "thrown" (*Geworfen*) into the world with others such that it may take up its inherited possibilities. Heidegger rejects the linear view of time wherein the past is something left behind as time moves forward along a continuum toward an open-ended future. For Heidegger what has been – the past, heritage, birth – is rather first given from the horizon of the future: "'birth' is taken into existence in coming back from the possibility of death (the possibility not-to-be-bypassed) so that existence may accept the THROWNNESS of its own There more free from illusion" (SZ 391). This model of temporality remains with Heidegger throughout his writing.[1]

---

[1] In "On Time and Being" (1962), for example, he writes: "approaching, being not yet present, at the same time gives and brings about what is no longer present, the past, and conversely what has been offers future to itself. The reciprocal relation of both at the same time gives and brings about the present" (GA14:18/OTB 14).

In *Being and Time* Heidegger begins by describing Dasein as thrown into an inauthentic world that has forgotten about being – the hidden ground of its authentic possibilities. Fixated only on entities that appear on the order of objective presence – possibilities amenable to measurement, weight, and calculation – Dasein overlooks the non-present or hidden ground of its authentic existence. Understood temporally in its historicity this hidden ground or world is heritage. "The resoluteness in which Dasein comes back to itself discloses the actual factical possibilities of authentic existing *in terms of the heritage* which that resoluteness *takes over* as thrown. Resolute coming back to thrownness involves *handing oneself over* to traditional possibilities, although not necessarily as traditional ones" (SZ 383).

To hand oneself over to traditional possibilities is not to bring back the past, nor to engage past possibilities per se. This would be a leveling down of possibilities belonging to inauthentic Dasein that understands only objectively present things devoid of a historical world. To hand oneself over to traditional possibilities is to hand oneself over to the *world* from which traditional possibilities arise. Not to the relics or remnants of the past housed in a museum, but to "the world within which they were encountered as things at hand belonging to a context of useful things and used by Dasein existing-in-the-world" (SZ 380). Taking up this world is how Dasein exists futurally as fate (*Schicksal*).

Inseparable from Dasein's heritage and fate is its DESTINY (*Geschick*), which is related closely to the idea of community for Heidegger. It is in conjunction with Dasein's destiny, its community (*Gemeinschaft*), that Heidegger discusses the personal identity of an individual Dasein, or "the who of Dasein" (SZ 375). "But if fateful Dasein essentially exists as BEING-IN-THE-WORLD in being-with others, its occurrence is an occurrence-with and is determined as destiny. With this term, we designate the occurrence of the community, of a people (*Volk*)" (SZ 384). Here it is important to note that Heidegger's is not a conservative or right-wing approach linking heritage, fate, and destiny to an already given people. A people is not defined by a simple tie to pre-given cultural values or traditional possibilities. Traditional possibilities do not belong inherently or exclusively to a certain people as an immediate birthright. Significantly, for Heidegger heritage and traditional possibilities exist only in the being handed down itself; that is, heritage comes into being only by way of action upon traditional possibilities and not prior to that.

Traditional possibilities are therefore constituted anew in the present. Only in taking up possibilities that are there to be handed down, only then may traditional possibilities point back to the world that has been there so the past may be in the present. Da-sein takes up its heritage through a kind of dialogue with those who have been there before by responding to the world from which these others understood their possibilities. Heidegger calls this REPETITION. It is also because heritage must be taken up in the present to be at all that Heidegger characterizes authenticity as a "burden," a responsibility that must be acted upon if it is to be at all. To retrieve or repeat possibilities is not to relate to things dead and past. "Rather repetition responds to the possibility of existence that has-been-there" (SZ 386).

As a horizon out of which possibilities are understood, heritage is a particular mode of revealing (*Entbergen*). Revealing is essentially how things show up for humans as making sense. All modes of revealing set humans upon a particular trajectory or destiny of being. But Heidegger is gravely concerned about the danger of revealing belonging to METAPHYSICS and TECHNOLOGY. At the

heart of what is dangerous about the destining belonging to technology is that nothing is worth preserving, everything is to be consumed and disposed of, and anything that escapes objectification – the uncertain, the unknowable – is overlooked as insignificant. "Every mystery loses its power" (SZ 127). In contrast to the destining belonging to technology is that belonging to heritage. Heritage reveals the EARTH as a place of DWELLING to be preserved rather than as mere resources to be consumed, controlled, and depleted.

By contrast, the signal feature of technology's mode of revealing (*Ge-Stell*; see INVENTORY and SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT(ION)ING) is that little matters enough to care for, or to preserve. Rootlessness prevails, nothing endures. Indeed for Heidegger the plight of homelessness (*Heimatlosigkeit*) and uprootedness from one's historical existence is the essential symptom of the FORGETFULNESS OF BEING and characteristic of inauthenticity. The uprootedness of modern existence is a consistent theme for Heidegger.[2] In *Being and Time* Heidegger characterizes the country not just as a field of grass, but "as a countryside, as areas that have been inhabited or exploited, as battlefields and cultic sites" (SZ 389). In "The Origin of the Work of Art" (1935) he depicts a temple not simply as a collection of stones devoid of historical meaning but as something that opens up a world.

> It is the temple work that first structures and simultaneously gathers around itself the unity of those paths and relations in which birth and death, disaster and blessing, victory and disgrace, endurance and decline acquire for the human being the shape of its destiny. The all-governing expanse of these open relations is the world of this historical people. From and within this expanse the people first returns to itself for the completion of its vocation. (GA5:27–28/PLT 41)

This notion of a vocation has taken various tones over the course of Heidegger's writing. In his 1933 *Rektoratsrede* delivered at the height of his involvement with National Socialism, the vocation belonged narrowly to the Germans who were privileged in leading the world out of the entanglements brought about by the forgetting of being. Although we are well aware of the dangers of nationalism, especially within the German history of Nazism, perhaps the problem here is not in the identification of something that characterizes Germanness per se, but the centrality of favoring the Germans as saviors and a narrow definition of what counted as German. In other words, specifying and defining cultural identity is not in and of itself problematic, for without specific cultures there can be no multiculturalism and diversity to speak of. Cultures preserved in heritage provide us with roots that allow differences to flourish.

As stated above, Heidegger's conception of heritage has not been thoughtfully engaged by scholars primarily because of said difficulty in disentangling the concept from his interlude with National Socialism. Yet, there is much of value in a discussion of heritage, particularly as it may provide us with the ontological landscape for understanding the layers and practices that characterize what it means to belong to a historical community. In an increasingly rootless world driven by an all-consuming globalizing market, this is important. Heritage's radical

---

[2] Returning to this theme in "*Gelassenheit*" (1959) he writes: "All that with which modern techniques of communication stimulate, assail, and drive man – all that is already much closer to man today than his fields around his farmstead, closer than the sky over the earth, closer than the change from night to day, closer than the conventions and customs of his village, than the tradition of his native world" (GA16:520/DT 48).

potential lies in pointing us away from commercial and disposable concerns toward preservation and care. To counter the conservative approach to heritage it is important to remember that for Heidegger heritage is not already given as a native or natural attachment. Heritage is futural, as it must be chosen anew in the present for it to be at all. The world belonging to the Greek temple described above is no longer present. The temple itself, however, does remain. This temple may be related to in light of heritage by reverence afforded it by inhabitants and even thoughtful visitors walking its paths. Or, heritage may be covered over by placing the temple at the center of a food court at a new joint venture Disney theme park backed by the Greek Ministry of Culture.

Sharin N. Elkholy

HERMENEUTICAL AS (*HERMENEUTISCHE ALS*). SEE AS-STRUCTURE.

100.
HERMENEUTICS (*HERMENEUTIK*)

Hermeneutics is the practice of an interpretation or the original dissemination of a message or announcement, especially with regard to man's relation to being (SZ 37–38; GA12:115, 119/OWL 29, 32–33; GA63:14). Going back to the lexical meaning of the Greek word *hermêneuein* (to make known, announce, communicate, disseminate, interpret), Heidegger holds that this practice is directed in the first instance at the things and people we encounter in the world. In contrast to traditional hermeneutics, throughout his works Heidegger insists that the root meaning of hermeneutics is not a theory about interpretation or a commentary on a text. In his "A Dialogue on Language," Heidegger acknowledges the significance of hermeneutical philosophers such as Schleiermacher and Dilthey for his own work (GA12:92/OWL 10–11). However, if in these thinkers the understanding (*Verstehen*) and interpretation of utterances, texts, and works of art, as handed down by the tradition, is of paramount importance, then Heidegger transforms and expands the scope of hermeneutics. In his mature works, hermeneutics encompasses both the "understanding of being" (*Seinsverständnis*, SZ 1) and the understanding of Dasein, i.e., the "hermeneutic of Dasein" (SZ 38), as well as the in-between of "language and being" (*Sprache und Sein*) in which this understanding operates (GA12:91/OWL 9–10).

Therefore, Heidegger is not interested in constructing rules for guiding the proper understanding and interpretation of utterances and texts (as Schleiermacher), nor in extracting categories from the shared understanding of other people and the tradition for the epistemological foundation of the historical disciplines (*Geisteswissenschaften*), nor in clarifying the specific method of understanding in the humanities vis-à-vis explanation in the natural sciences (as Dilthey). For Heidegger, understanding is the primordial ground from which both explanation and understanding as species of cognition derive; and it also precedes the division between intuition and thought, undercutting both rationalism and empiricism (SZ 142–43, 147). Furthermore, Heidegger also notes that "talk of the hermeneutical circle" remains "superficial" (GA12:143/OWL 51) if it ignores Dasein's ontological and temporal relation to being upon which the circle is founded.

After World War I, Heidegger worked on a "hermeneutic phenomenology" (GA12:90/OWL 9), attempting to fuse the phenomenological return to "the things themselves" with the hermeneutical maxim that any explication of an experience has to "re-enact" or "go along with" the stream of experiences and the historical situation in which it occurs. Drawing on Husserl's concept of the natural attitude and the life-world and Dilthey's concept of the historical forms (objectifications) of life, Heidegger argues that for the most part we find ourselves engaged within a meaningful, pre-theoretical, non-objective, familiar, environing world (of friends, acquaintances, home, family, the office, the doctor's practice, work colleagues, and so on) (see GA56/57:70–73). Thus, we are always already immersed in that which is meaningful, *das Bedeutsame*, which is immediately understandable and intelligible (GA56/57:73). Every person draws on "an inherent stock of intelligibilities" (*Fonds von Verständlichkeiten*) and comes with the

"immediate accessibility (*unmittelbaren Zugänglichkeiten*) to the things around" them (GA58:34). The primary relation to the world around us is not cognitive theory construction, interpretation of raw data, but pre-theoretical, immediate understanding (*Verstehen*) of the familiar and manifest life-world.

In order to thematize these pre-theoretical, everyday experiences or intelligibilities, we need to follow their very own context, situation, horizon, and direction of SENSE or INTENTION-ALITY. This can be done by sympathetically and "understandingly" (*verstehend*) going along with them in what Heidegger dubs the "*hermeneutical intuition*" (GA56/57:117). This intuition is hermeneutical in contrast to the reflective intuition in Husserl's phenomenology, where the phenomenologist steps outside the stream of experiences (*epoché*) in order to delineate the structure of the intended object and the intentional act as such. Moreover, Heidegger also insists that what is given in hermeneutic intuition requires further phenomenological "interpretation" (GA58:254). This interpretation puts into words and thus shapes what is "seen" in intuition, but from "within" the sphere of the experiences themselves, releasing their "*verbum internum*," which, as Heidegger notes, has nothing to with the object-theoretical attempt to "logicize" them (GA60:63). For Heidegger, it is imperative not only to hold at bay the vocabulary of the natural sciences and naturalism, but to break the "primacy of the theoretical" (GA56/57:87). In short, Heidegger contrasts hermeneutical and phenomenological "understanding" not just to naturalism and objectivism, but to "the theoretical" as such.

To avoid the intrusion of theoretical objectivity, Heidegger develops the concept of the "FORMAL INDICATION" (*formale Anzeige*), which aims at "pointing to" or "indicating" the way in which a phenomenon is to be interpreted from within the situation in which it appears, but not to be defined for all times, as if it were an isolated, fixed object with definite properties (GA60:62–65). For Heidegger, meaning is situational and historical, and thus also open for change in the future. Formal indication attempts to do justice to this by resisting the temptation to subsume whatever is thematized under the framework of an unchanging, ideal, and theoretical objectivity. Instead, it deliberately contents itself with throwing a first preliminary light on a phenomenon without foreclosing future revisions, corrections, amendments, amplifications, and so on (see GA60:65). This cautious withholding of definitional fixations and the acceptance of the open texture of hermeneutical concepts holds for all the key phenomena that Heidegger "indicates" in his subsequent works, such as for example, DEATH, CONSCIENCE, HISTORY, Dasein, CARE, BEING, and so on.

Given that we always already are immersed in a meaningful world, Heidegger holds that we live within "a handed-down, re-worked, or newly established interpretedness (*Ausgelegtheit*)" (GA62:354). We find ourselves within a "hermeneutic situation," where the various interpretations of the past intersect and create an opening for an interpretive or hermeneutic intervention, in order to continue, criticize, reject, and thus reshape and reinterpret our very understanding of the past meanings handed down to us. This hermeneutical situation is not something objectively given, like a state of affairs, but, rather, something to be seized, appropriated, and projected into the future (GA62: 345, 347, esp. note 4). Heidegger notes that all interpretation draws together three moments: "the position of looking" (*Blickstand*), the actual position in the historical situation from whence the interpretation starts, "the scope of looking" (*Blickhabe*), meaning the "as what" the *interpretandum* is taken initially, and "the line of looking" (*Blickbahn*), the thematic and conceptual field into which the interpreted subject is to be integrated (GA62:345). In *Being and Time* Heidegger keeps this tripartite structure of interpretation, using new terms,

i.e., the FORE-STRUCTURE made up of a fore-having (*Vorhabe*), fore-sight (*Vorsicht*), and fore-conception (*Vorgriff*) (SZ 151–52). Transparency of the hermeneutic situation requires that these three elements are recognized and owned within the interpretation itself – and not suppressed in an attempt to find some extra-hermeneutical, presuppositionless objectivity. For Heidegger, "interpretation" can never be "presuppositionless thematization" (SZ 150). But the interpretation also needs to be checked against what the phenomena show, in order to avoid the corrupting influence of both conventional hearsay and tradition. This critical side of hermeneutics Heidegger calls "deconstruction" (*Destruktion*), noting that it is an inseparable part of hermeneutics (SZ 19–27; GA24:26–32; GA62:368).

In 1923 Heidegger delivered his lecture course on the "hermeneutics of FACTICITY," which aimed at elaborating and explicating the understanding of Dasein. Dasein is "in each case one's own," and not some generic idea above the many (GA63:7). Heidegger holds that because Dasein can misunderstand itself and fall into "self-alienation" (*Selbstentfremdung*), it is imperative that it come to grips with itself and develop its proper self-understanding, in order to exist as itself, "understandingly" (*verstehend*). And this means that Dasein must become "fully" awake to its possibilities, because factically Dasein exists as its "determinate historical possibility" within its own hermeneutical and historical situation (GA63:15, 19).

In *Being and Time* Heidegger further developed this hermeneutics of facticity in ontological terms, arguing that Dasein's "understanding of itself" (*Verständnis seiner selbst*) is always achieved in relation to an "understanding of being" (*eines Verstehens von Sein*, SZ 12; see also SZ 152, GA24:21). For "everything we talk about, what we mean, what we relate to in this way or that, is being (*Seiend*), and that and how we are is being (*Seiend*) too" (SZ 6–7). That is, in whatever way Dasein understands itself, behaves, engages others, and pursues its projects, it does so with an implicit "pre-ontological understanding of being" (SZ 15). The philosophical inquiry into the SENSE or meaning of being takes its departure from this presupposition of a pre-ontological understanding, which, however, must not be construed as a logical premise, from which one could logically conclude the determinate meaning of being, because that would be "circular reasoning" indeed (SZ 8; see also 202). Instead, the philosophical interpretation of being articulates, explicates, and "lays bare the ground" of being insofar as it shows itself in and through Dasein's pre-ontological understanding (SZ 8). And because Dasein itself is a being and understands itself within the horizon of being, it is directly implicated in the clarification of being as such. That is, the philosophical explication of the meaning of being, starting from Dasein, is bound to come full circle in a changed understanding of Dasein (see SZ 8; GA26:285). There is an "ontological circle-structure" at play here, and Heidegger insists that everything hinges on entering into this circle "in the right manner," part of which is to understand that neither being nor Dasein are entities, least of all OCCURRENT entities (SZ 153).

Within this overall hermeneutic-ontological framework, Heidegger assigns the hermeneutical relation primacy within Dasein itself, arguing that, equiprimordially with DIS-POSEDNESS (*Befindlichkeit*) and DISCOURSE (*Rede*), "understanding" (*Verstehen*) is one of Dasein's "existential structures" (SZ 142). Dasein always already finds itself in the world and has "an understanding of world" (*Verstehen von Welt*, SZ 86). More specifically, Dasein understands its way around by circumspectively navigating its course through the familiar environing world, and what is thus disclosed is "the whole fundamental

constitution of BEING-IN-THE-WORLD," that is, the understanding of "being as such" (SZ 144, 146).

This understanding is not propositional knowledge, and certainly not instinctive either. In understanding its being-in-the-world, Dasein understands what to do in the world, how to move on, how to relate to others, and how to understand itself. That is, Dasein projects its "ABILITY TO BE" (*Sein-können*) into the ongoing affairs of the world around it, thus pressing ahead into and opening up the very possibilities (*Möglichkeiten*) the world affords. This "projecting character of the understanding" (*Entwurfscharakter des Verstehens*) means that to understand is to project – to open up a way to be in the world (SZ 145).

Heidegger radically redraws the traditionally asserted sharp boundaries between understanding and INTERPRETATION (*Auslegung*), arguing that interpretation is not a distinct, second-order operation on and alteration of the original material gathered in the understanding, but, rather, the explicit articulation, expression, and appropriation of what is already inherent in the understanding. That is, in and through interpretation understanding "becomes itself" (SZ 148). However, interpretation can render explicit, unfold, and lift into the open what is understood only because the understanding is interpretive itself. Projecting into possibilities, understanding takes something *as* something, and thus interprets this something for some purpose within the context of significations and references of the environing world. Even "the pre-predicative simple looking at something available" is interpretive, or as Heidegger puts it, the simple looking is "understandingly interpretive" (*verstehend-auslegend*, SZ 149). To understand is to interpret, because to understand means to take something *as* something, whereby this something is lifted into an interpretive or hermeneutical frame. This hermeneutical or interpretive "*as*" operates already on the level of the understanding, prior to its articulation and explicit "thematization" in interpretation (SZ 149). That the hermeneutical "as" is not always expressly stated and verbalized in understanding must not mislead us to think it is not there at all (SZ 149–50, 157; see AS-STRUCTURE). Words "accrue" to meanings and interpretations, but they do not institute them (SZ 161).

Heidegger further emphasizes the pre-theoretical primacy and interdependence of understanding and interpretation by arguing that in relation to them the mode of theoretical ASSERTION (*Aussage*) is always "derivative," and not a faithful replication, but, rather, an alteration and "modification" of what is present in the original understanding and interpretation (SZ 153–54). The SUBJECT–OBJECT structure in an apophantic assertion first decontextualizes the original hermeneutical "as" by blocking out the projective context of the enveloping hermeneutical situation (effectively suppressing the available character of what is grasped in original understanding and interpretation), in order to recontextualize what remains as something merely occurrent (a fixed subject) with certain definite properties (predicates), thus firmly situating it within the plane of theoretical objectivity, outside the initial hermeneutical situation and the world.

After *Being and Time* Heidegger moved away from his earlier explicit hermeneutical concerns and he no longer put hermeneutics at the center of his philosophizing. But his turn toward LANGUAGE and his insistence on the disclosive power vested in language bespeak a continuation of hermeneutics by other means. In fact, even in *Contributions to Philosophy (of the Event)* Heidegger still reaffirmed, without any qualifications, that one can get hold of Dasein "only hermeneutically" (GA65:321).

Ingo Farin

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 2–40, 142–60; GA12:81–146/OWL 1–56; GA24:20–33; GA26:285; GA56/57:70–117; GA58:25–40; GA60:57–65; GA62:345–75; GA63:1–33; GA65:321

FURTHER READING

Dahlstrom 2001, Dreyfus 1991, Farin 2015, Figal and Gander 2005, Gadamer 1990, Herrmann 2000, Lafont 2000, Malpas 2016, Misch 1931, Ricoeur 1981, Wrathall 2013b, Schear 2013b, Zaborowski 2011

101.
HINT (*WINK*)

A HINT IS AN inconspicuous sign or signal that might help to solve a philosophical problem. The German verb *winken*, from which the noun "hint" (*Wink*) is derived, literally means "to wave" or "to beckon." Heidegger employs the noun "hint" in the metaphorical sense of a gesture that leads into the right direction. However, the bodily connotation of the word is not important in his usage. *Wink* can be translated adequately as "sign" or "hint"; *winken* as "to hint," "to give a sign," or "to beckon."

Heidegger does not use the word "hint" in the early lecture courses or in *Being and Time*. Nevertheless, he refers in *Being and Time* to two issues that are related to the later concept of the hint. (1) Heidegger distinguishes signs from other things that appear AVAILABLE (*zuhanden*). A sign is not only related to a context, but when we identify a sign "the surrounding world becomes expressly accessible for CIRCUMSPECTION" (SZ 82). (2) Heidegger distinguishes between the full phenomenological experience of a matter and the possibility to merely describe it preliminarily. The latter is what he calls "FORMAL INDICATION" (*formale Anzeige*, SZ 114). As a sign in general, a hint opens a new perspective on the world. Yet, it only leads the way to understanding a phenomenon, it does not provide the full phenomenological experience. In this regard, a hint has a function similar to formal indication. But unlike formal indication, it is not a methodological step but something that has to be received by the philosopher from outside in order to inspire his work.

The "hint" plays an important role in Heidegger's interpretation of Hölderlin's poetry. After writing on Hölderlin, Heidegger subsequently adopts the word into his own vocabulary. In the essay *Hölderlin and the Essence of Poetry*, Heidegger quotes a sentence from Hölderlin's poem *Rousseau:* "and hints are, / From time immemorial, the LANGUAGE of the gods" (*und Winke sind | Von Alters her die Sprache der Götter*, GA4:46/63). In this poem, Hölderlin compares the meeting of strangers who do not share a language – but can try to express themselves by making gestures (*Winke*) – with a religious experience. In his interpretation, Heidegger stresses the spiritual dimension of Hölderlin's comparison. He describes the creation of poetry as an interpretation of hints and as a transformation of those hints – that come from a divine sphere – into words that can be understood not only by the poet but all people who share one language. Thus, the poet is pictured as a mediator between gods and humans. The poet takes up the role of the Platonic *eros*. In his first lecture course on Hölderlin, Heidegger defines the process of "poeticizing as receiving the beckoning (*Winke*) of the gods and passing them on (*Weiterwinken*) to the PEOPLE" (GA39:32). In the same passage, Heidegger associates the existence of gods with giving signs: "the gods simply beckon [*winken*], however, insofar as they *are* [*sind*]" (GA39:32). This implies that the existence of gods is essentially bound to their presence in the human world. Heidegger takes up this notion of deity when he translates and interprets Heraclitus' fragment B 93 about Apollo: "the lord, whose oracle is at Delphi … neither says, nor does he conceal, but rather beckons [*winkt*]" (GA39:127; see also GA55:177).

A hint can be found in a philosophical sentence or even a single word and its etymology. Heidegger takes the ancient Greek word for TRUTH, *alêtheia*, and the literal translation of this word as "unconcealment" (*Unverborgenheit*), to be a hint for understanding the ESSENCE of BEING (GA9:369/280). The Old German word *buan* is taken as a hint for understanding human DWELLING (GA7:148/PLT 44). The title of a philosophical text – such as *Thus spoke Zarathustra* – can be taken as a hint how to read the text. Heidegger points out that the protagonist of Nietzsche's work is announced as a "speaker" (*Sprecher*, GA7:101/N2 211). In Heidegger's understanding, philosophically relevant hints can be discovered only by someone who pays attention to marginal phenomena and language. Discovering this kind of hint is said to be difficult and only achieved by "listening" to language (GA8:142/138). A hint is necessarily vague and it remains uncertain even after someone has developed a philosophical argument that was inspired by it (GA10:188/128). Therefore – as Heidegger elaborates in *A Dialogue on Language* – what he means by *Wink* is not a concept in the strict sense (GA12:108/OWL 25). It is rather an idea that belongs to a poetic understanding of language: "hints hint in many ways" (*Winke winken auf vielfältige Weise*, GA12:191/OWL 96). Language can provide philosophically relevant hints for two reasons. First, linguistic structures develop through time and preserve the existential experiences of earlier generations. And second, as language is constantly changing, it allows for new ways of addressing issues that matter to oneself.

Finally, it should be noticed that Heidegger calls some of his own poems *Winke*. By choosing this name he intends to distinguish these texts from the sort of poetry that employs metaphors to express pre-given thoughts. When Heidegger writes poems and not prose, he does so in order to try out a new way of finding words for the essence of being (GA13:33).

Nikola Mirkovic

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Hints and poetry GA4:74/95–96, 82/106; GA7:198/PLT 220; GA10:188/128; GA11:118/QCT 41; GA13:33, 125, 222, 224; GA16:297, 717; GA39:32
Hints from etymology GA7:276/EGT 112
Hints and deities GA4:46/63; GA5:272/202–03; GA7:151–52, 180/PLT 147, 176; GA7:227/EGT 72; GA39:32, 127; GA55:177
Hints in the pre-Socratics GA4:179/203; GA7:276/EGT 112; GA8:223/219; GA11:37/HR 287–88; GA13:238
Listening to language as a way of finding hints GA5:342/258, 361/272; GA7:101/N2 211; GA8:142/138, 178/174; GA9:476/360; GA12:108–11/OWL 25–27, 190/96

HISTORIOGRAPHY (*HISTORIE*). SEE HISTORY (*GESCHICHTE*).

HISTORIOLOGY (*HISTORIE*). SEE HISTORY.

HISTORIZE (*GESCHEHEN*). SEE HISTORY.

102.
HISTORY (*GESCHICHTE*)

Hﾉﾉ I STORY AS ORDINARILY understood is:

> (1) a meaningful sequence of happenings or events – "the connectedness of move-
>   ments in the alterations of objects" (SZ 389).

The meaningfulness at issue in history is distinct from the intelligibility that the natural sciences uncover in causal sequences of events. In history, as distinct from nature, the significance of entities is determined by the the WORLD to which they belong (SZ 381). Historical events are "world-historical happenings" (*weltgeschichtliches Geschehen*; see SZ 19).

In a sense derived from this first meaning, "history" names:

> (2) a branch of knowledge concerned with uncovering the SENSE or MEANING that
>   makes intelligible a sequence of happenings or events.

"The term 'history,'" Heidegger explains, "means both the 'historical reality' and also the possible science of it" (SZ 378) – i.e., the science of what is historically real. Heidegger calls history in the second sense *Historie*, usually translated as "historiology" or "historiography."

Heidegger also uses "history" in two special senses: history is

> (3) "a way of being of Dasein" (SZ 386) – DASEIN is the "historizing" of history in
>   the sense that, by disclosing the temporal horizons of the world, it is the ground
>   for the inherent connectedness of past, present, and future (see TIME).

"Dasein's being is historical – that is to say . . . by reason of its ecstatico-horizonal temporality it is open in its character of 'having-been'" (SZ 394). In particular, Dasein historizes by inhabiting a set of concrete possibilities for existence that it inherits from its community (see SZ 385ff.). "The being of Dasein," Heidegger argues, is "constituted first of all by historizing, so that anything like circumstances, events, and vicissitudes is ontologically possible only because Dasein is historical in its being" (SZ 379).

In Heidegger's later works, history refers primarily to

> (4) the sequence of distinct worlds, each of which is determined or defined by
>   a distinct understanding of being (see HISTORY OF BEING).

The "deepest history" is the unfolding of "the sequence of EPOCHS in the DESTINY of being" (GA14:9). On the basis of this deepest history, Heidegger argues, Western civilizations have developed through the "hidden history" of METAPHYSICS – that is, the sequence of distinct metaphysical interpretations of being. Each metaphysical understanding in this hidden history "lays the foundations of an age" in the sense that a metaphysic gives an age "the basis of its essential form through a particular interpretation of entities and a particular grasp of TRUTH. This basis prevails throughout all appearances which distinguish the age" (GA5:75/QCT 115). But Heidegger argues that the succession of

metaphysical understandings of being in the "hidden history" of metaphysics together constitutes one age within the deeper history.

DASEIN AS A HISTORICAL BEING

We human beings disclose the world as historical because we always encounter situations on the basis of a set of dispositions, skills, and practices that we've inherited from our community – a community that itself is a vibrant embodiment of the past. This past, in turn, opens up a set of possibilities which determine the significance of, and delimit the availability of, the options for action that are open to us at any given moment. In this way, we exist as beings who always have a future in terms of a past that has been "handed down" to us. And we inhabit the present by authentically taking up and "repeating" our historical inheritance – that is, by taking up a particular historical practice, projecting it over the world to disclose a particular set of possibilities, and developing the practice in new ways in terms of the present context (see SZ 386–87).

In many ways, the third sense of history – history as a way of being of Dasein – is the core sense for Heidegger. Human beings "exist historically" – that is, they inhabit a world that is structured by temporal horizons. Because we exist historically, history in the first sense is possible: happenings or events can have a historical significance and can show up as connected in a meaningful sequence. The historical character of antique artifacts is derived from the fact that there once were, but are no longer, human beings who were skillfully attuned to the practical settings to which those antiquities belonged (SZ 381). Thus, more generally, entities are "world-historical" – i.e., belong to history – "only by reason of their belonging to the world" (SZ 381). They belong to a world, in turn, only because they serve and subserve human activities within the world.

The science of history or historiology – history in the second sense – is only possible because we, as historical beings, can have a historical consciousness: "out of this kind of being of the entity that exists historically, there arises the existentiell possibility of expressly disclosing and recording history," that is to say, the possibility of the "thematization" or "the historiological (*historische*) disclosure of history" (SZ 376). Heidegger argues that the proper practice of historiology is to articulate and make salient the structure of possibilities of existence that "have-been-there" (SZ 395).

Finally, the history of being also depends on the existence of historical beings like us who preserve a particular understanding of being or receive a new disclosure of being: "history is the history of ʙᴇʏɴɢ," Heidegger claims, "and therefore history is the history of the truth of beyng, and therefore history is the history of the grounding of truth and therefore history is history as Dasein" (GA69:93). That is, history as the unfolding of a sequence of distinct epochs or disclosures of being requires a being like us who can historicize, thereby providing a foundation on which the sequence can unfold (see GA65:430; and see also Hɪsᴛᴏʀʏ ᴏꜰ Bᴇɪɴɢ).

Mark A. Wrathall

ʀᴇꜰᴇʀᴇɴᴄᴇs ɪɴ ʜᴇɪᴅᴇɢɢᴇʀ

Historiography (*Historie*) SZ 10, 20, 152, 375, 392ff.; GA5:83/62–63, 326ff./246ff.; GA6.2:349ff./N4 240ff.; GA7:25, 58ff./QCT 24, 175ff.; GA9:104/83; GA11:49/HR 294; GA17:88; GA20:9; GA27:163; GA29/30:407; GA45:34ff.; GA50:148ff.; GA55:69, 193; GA65:151ff., 455, 479, 492ff.;

103.

HISTORY OF BEING (*GESCHICHTE DES SEINS*)

THE HISTORY OF being is the unfolding of a succession of different styles of BEING, each of which provides the foundation for a distinct WORLD or epoch.

The history of being is a central theme in Heidegger's later work, but it is prefigured already in the intention, announced in *Being and Time*, to perform "a destruction of the history of ontology" (SZ 19, 23). Following the publication of *Being and Time*, Heidegger comes to believe that, behind the history of philosophical ONTOLOGY or of thinking (i.e., behind the succession of different philosophical accounts of being), there lies a history of different ways in which "being sends itself (*schickt sich zu*) to humans in that it clearingly arranges for entities as such a temporal-play-space. Being essences as such a sent DESTINY (*Geschick*), as a self-revealing, that at the same time preserves as a self-concealing. The history of Western thought rests in the destiny of being" (GA10:111/75).

For Heidegger, the history of philosophy as it has been "handed down and interpreted" amounts to "an almost hopeless confusion of ideas and opinions" that makes the history of being difficult to discern (GA10:112/75–76). This is in part a consequence of the fact that philosophical approaches to ontology have traditionally searched for an account of the being of entities that will explain all entities everywhere and always. But as Heidegger reads it, the history of philosophy is a sequence of different understandings of entities, rather than a progressive approach to a clearer and more adequate, unified and total account of being. This leads Heidegger to conclude that philosophy has been searching for something that is not there to be found. There *is* no account of being that will apply equally to, say, the internet and a religious icon. We have now entered an age, moreover, where there is little felt need to provide an account of the being of entities. Without thinkers reflecting on the question of being, Heidegger fears, we are more completely at the mercy of the currently prevailing understanding of being than ever before. Thus, Heidegger argues, philosophy at the end of the history of METAPHYSICS needs to reinvent itself – to find a new kind of thought which, rather than trying to offer an account of being, gives us insight into what allowed there to be different understandings of being in the first place. This will demand a more rigorous (*strenger*) thought than ever engaged in before, and much of Heidegger's later work is devoted to developing the rigor appropriate to thinking the history of being

1   THE HISTORY OF BEING AND ORDINARY HISTORY

Heidegger argues that the ordinary history of the West – the history of people and things and happenings, of wars, of the birth and decline of nations, of scientific advances and discoveries, of changing artistic and cultural styles, of varying philosophical systems and doctrines – is shaped by a history of being. The history of being consists of a sequence of metaphysical ages:

> Metaphysics grounds an age, in that through a specific interpretation of what is and through a specific comprehension of truth it gives to that age the ground of its essential character or shape [*Wesensgestalt*]. This ground holds complete dominion over all the appearances that distinguish the age. (GA5:75/QCT 115)

In each historical age or epoch, being has a different character or style: "'being' and 'being' respectively say something different in the different epochs of their destiny" (GA10:91/62).

Among the appearances that distinguish an age, Heidegger explicitly includes a given world's science, religion, artworks, modes of production, and philosophical doctrines. Each of these appearances bears, within a given epoch, a certain familial resemblance to the other appearances of the age – all share an "essential character." But if one focuses on the historical development of each phenomenon individually, one easily loses sight of the underlying history of changes in the essential character or style of being. This is because ordinary history gives the impression of an unbroken sequence of happenings and doctrines, each one arising from the previous and giving way to the next. This appearance of continuity conceals a series of fundamental ruptures in the way being and TRUTH function in grounding different worlds. Thus, Heidegger argues that the history of being is a hidden history: "there is nothing of this history in the history book, nor should there be, because history books bear a different responsibility" (GA44:27).

Some critics of Heidegger, most notably Richard Rorty, have charged that Heidegger's talk of a history of being is vacuous. The only thing that could give Heidegger's account of the history of being genuine rigor, Rorty argues, is to hold it responsible to the ordinary events that transpire in the world. This would allow us to test whether the thought of the clearing or *Ereignis* (ADAPTATION) accords with what we find in the world around us.

> Unless Heidegger connected the history of Being with that of men and nations through such phrases as "a nation's (*eines Volkes*) relation to Being," and thus connected the history of philosophy with just plain history … we shall still be as far as ever from that which is *strenger als das Begriffliche*. Without the reference to the history of nations, we should obviously have only … "an all too empty and formal, though often emotionally charged and mystically-religious, thinking of absolute unity." (Rorty 1982, 48).

While Rorty is right that Heidegger himself offers little by way of connecting his account of the history of being with "just plain history," Heidegger does at points recognize that his historical thought, when trying to make sense of being, is compelled "to take seriously the entities that are moved into the light of its being" (GA5:96/QCT 137). The relationship between an understanding of being and entities is, then, fairly direct. To say that entities "are moved into the light of being" is to hold that being subtly shapes and determines the salience and significance that entities have. This means that Heidegger acknowledges Rorty's point: his account of the history of being can and should be tested by looking to the stuff of ordinary history – the phenomena or "appearances that distinguish an age." In reflecting on the modern age, for instance, Heidegger looks to experimental science, machine technology, aesthetic approaches to art, the development of high culture, and the simultaneous Christianization and secularization of the world (with its "historiographical and psychological investigation of myth") (see GA5:75–76/QCT 115–16).

Heidegger's primary method for connecting ordinary history to the history of being is the practice of REFLECTION (*Besinnung*). The German word's root is formed from *Sinn*, SENSE or

meaning, and following this root meaning, Heidegger understands *Besinnung* as an interpretive method that proceeds by tracing out the background sense and meaningful structures that allow something to have the sense that it does.[1] For Heidegger, attending to historical changes in foreground practices and entities, is a central element in the practice of reflection on the background sense in terms of which events make sense.

Thus while reflection, and inquiry into the history of being more broadly, is not an empirical inquiry, it does take seriously the entities, personalities, and events of ordinary history because it asks about the conditions that allow empirical entities and events to appear *as* the things that they are. Having said that, however, Rorty is right that Heidegger looks primarily to the history of philosophy – to philosophical accounts of being – and only secondarily at the events of ordinary history. This is because Heidegger believed that the doctrines of great thinkers express, more directly and clearly than ordinary events, the sense of being that sustains their world. Still, Heidegger's interpretation of these thinkers is ultimately only illuminating to the degree that he can successfully demonstrate this – that he can show how these thinkers had an implicit understanding of being that allows us to pull into focus all the disparate events and entities of their world, thereby helping us to see why things hold the significance they do for inhabitants of the world and why it makes sense to the inhabitants of a world to respond to the happenings about them in the way that they do.

But what does it mean to say that being can take on different styles? And what is the alternative to a metaphysical manifestation of being? To make sense of such things, we need to say something about the relationship between the history of being and Heidegger's meta-ontology.

2 THE HISTORY OF BEYNG

Heidegger has a deeply relationalist account of what it is to be an entity. That is, entities are holistically constituted by their relations (*Beziehungen*) to other entities, activities, aims, and the unfolding of events. Some relations are essential to the being of a thing, while others are marginal or accidental. Which relations are essential and which are not is a function of the understanding of being that prevails in the world. The history of being (with an 'i') is essentially an account of the sequence of more or less stable styles of relational contexts that have prevailed in the West since the time of the Greeks.

But Heidegger is also interested in the history of BEYNG, which offers the background needed to understanding the sequence of different ways in which a volatile relational structure can get stabilized and drawn into mutual adaptation. This is the "deepest history," and it (or so Heidegger claims) falls into three main periods or epochs: "EMERGENCE, MACHINATION, ADAPTATION: these are the history of beyng" (GA69:213). *Emergence* describes the pre-metaphysical beyng of the ancient Greeks. *Machination* describes the beyng of the age of metaphysics, which, as we will see, is made up of several historical epochs, each containing a distinct but related articulated structure (*Gefüge*) of being. The age of *adaptation*, finally, describes a post-metaphysical beyng.

Emergence (*Aufgang*), which is Heidegger's translation of the Greek word *phusis* into German, is the pre-philosophical, polytheistic Greek mode of beyng. In the age of emergence, entities present themselves as self-stabilizing and self-supporting nodes of relations. For the polytheistic

---

[1] On *Besinnung* as a practice for fostering a sensibility for the sense of things, see Wrathall 2018.

Greeks, of course, the transient and unpredictable self-manifestation of entities depended in part on the GOD or goddess with whom one was attuned at the moment, and the way that god, with his or her particular aims, ordered a situation. The gods thus produced some degree of stability or intelligibility in a situation, even if the actual appearance of things was beyond the control of mortals. By learning to recognize how the pantheon functioned – by studying Hesiod, for instance – one might hope to discern in the world around one the nature of the various works and days, even if one could not control it nor fully anticipate what would happen. At their best, mortals were called to foster and tend to the emergence of entities in the world. The various ways of disclosing entities, however, were not expected to fit into an overall hierarchy of activities and values that would apply to all times and places. Indeed, the currently manifest god could disclose the world quite differently than the one who arrives next. The result was an unstable, ambiguous, and thus uncontrollable world.

The age of metaphysics begins when the relational whole of entities achieves a relative permanence, a unity, and coherence that will allow for planning, that is, "machination." Heidegger calls this transition from beyng as emergence to being as machination "the first INCEPTION" (see GA65:111).

In colloquial German, *Machenschaft* means plotting, intrigues, or machinations. However, Heidegger explains that "in the context of the question of being, this word does not name a human comportment but a kind of essencing of being. Even disparaging connotations should be kept at a distance, even though machination promotes the non-essence (*Unwesen*) of being" (GA65:126). Setting aside these negative connotations, "machinations" in the ordinary sense are instances of a kind of comportment that is able to anticipate and predict the unfolding of events, and "this comportment itself is only possible on the basis of an interpretation of entities which brings their feasibility [*machbarkeit*] to the fore, so much so that beingness is determined precisely as constancy and presence" (GA65:126). That is, "machination" names a mode of beyng in which entities manifest themselves in terms of how we can reliably use them to sustain our purposive actions. What it is feasible to do with entities shows up as something stable and enduring over time. Importantly, this stability of entities allows us to anticipate and deal with a wide range of possible ways that entities might show up. Machination is being prepared for what is feasible in everything we encounter: "machination is the preparation for the doability (*Machsamkeit*) of everything, so much so that the unceasingness of the unconditioned reckoning of each thing is pre-established" (GA66:16). In short, in an age of machination, everything becomes plannable in advance because its essential character is calculable and reliably knowable.

The metaphysical age is an age of machination, of planning, because entities are and show up in terms of those traits or characteristics which can always be found in them, and in terms of those relationships with other things that can be reliably anticipated. With this, the history of *being* commences – the history of distinct, unified ways in which entities present themselves as having a universal and stable being-character.

The history of being moves through a succession of different epochs. The initial projection of a new articulated structure, a new way of relating entities to each other, is a kind of leap, as there are no entities yet to support that structure. The leap will at first seem simply unintelligible, given the way entities are presently related and structured. But if the leap finds its footing in some entities, adaptation will occur, and entities and practices will draw each other in, suiting or fitting themselves to each other. That will effect an alteration in the relations with other things, which will set off a chain reaction of destabilizations followed by mutual adaptations and the articulation

of new sets of constitutive relations. Eventually the new world will be stabilized. Heidegger argues that poetic language and works of art in particular have precisely such a "world-forming power" – that is, they "first prefigure the being of entities in advance, and bring it into an articulated structure" (GA38:170/141; see also "The Origin of the Work of Art").

Let's look now at the epoch of metaphysics in more detail.

3   METAPHYSICS AND THE HISTORY OF BEING

Metaphysics for Heidegger is not a subfield within philosophy, nor is it a doctrine of a particular philosopher. Rather, a metaphysic is a particular way or style in which entities are relationally constituted. In a metaphysic, being is relatively *stable* (it endures long enough to seem as if it is eternal – for centuries if not millennia). It is *universal*, meaning it applies to every entity as it determines what is essential to that entity (the entity as such). It is *total*, meaning it also governs the whole coherence of actual entities as they relate to each other (what is as a whole, *das Seiende im Ganzen*). Because it provides a stable, universal, and total relational structure, it determines what entities really or truly are. The history of being is the history of a succession of different unified, stabilized, and totalizing styles in which entities present themselves to us as available for planning.

Although Heidegger never definitively and exhaustively catalogs the epochs of being, he tends to focus on a handful of "essentially different epochs and humankinds [*Menschentümer*] of Western history," namely, "Greek, Roman, medieval, modern, and present day [that is, the age of technology]" (GA54:142). When he is being more careful, Heidegger recognizes that each of these main epochs could be broken down into a number of distinct periods. Heidegger, for instance, distinguishes between early and consummate modernity. Still, it's possible to offer some general remarks about the overarching style of each of these main epochs.

In describing a historical epoch of being, Heidegger identifies a number of mutually support-ing features. One gains a sense for the overall coherence of the style of being of an age by attending to (1) which entities are taken to be paradigmatic of being; (2); how the age conceives of essence; (3) how the age conceives of existence (4) how the age conceives of truth; and (5) a claim or demand (*Anspruch*), which gives an overall purpose to our practices. These main features (*Hauptzüge*) of metaphysics are themselves dependent upon one another, and adapted to each other. Space constraints foreclose a full review of Heidegger's account of the history of being. Instead, I offer in what follows a few illustrative examples of the elements of Heidegger's account. The chart below offers a more systematic, if also sketchier, description.

(1) *The Paradigmatic Entity*. Each world has a different sense of what a typical entity is – that is, of an "entity that fulfills in an exceptional and preeminent sense what one tacitly understands in the everyday understanding of being as the beingness of an entity (its being)" (GA31:51). Such paradigmatic entities play a vital role in allowing a whole metaphysic to coalesce, because they show inhabitants of the world in a perspicuous way what it means to be. Paradigmatic entities show up as simply being what they are in themselves. They appear as fixed, determinate, and ontologically self-subsistent.

In order for a world to appear as independent, self-contained, and determinate, beyng and adaptation have to withdraw. We cannot, in other words, see the world as predictable if we recognize that it is the product of a contingent and temporary stabilization of an otherwise volatile relational structure. Thus, Heidegger explains, metaphysics necessarily involves the

The Deepest History
"Emergence, machination, adaptation are the history of beyng" (GA69:213)

Epoch	(1) *Paradigmatic Entities* (examples)	Being		(4) *Truth* The contexts within which entities can show what they really are	(5) *Claim* The call to which the inhabitants of the age respond in their practices
		(2) *Essence (Entities as such)* The defining feature, the possibilities that define what an entity is	(3) *Existence (Entities as a whole)* The actual features; the causality that determines that an entity is		
Pre-metaphysical (no unified understanding of being): **The Age of Emergence**					
Early Greek	nature (olive tree)	*phusis* – to be is to arise from out of itself, linger for a while, then withdraw.		unconcealment: revealing/concealing	to foster the emergence
The First Inception: **The Age of Machination (or "The Metaphysical Age")**					
Philosophic Greek	produced artifact (silver chalice)	*What* an entity is, is determined by *ideas*, self-subsistent forms	*That* something is depends on *energeia*	*homoiôsis – conformity* (*Angleichung*) of our thoughts with the forms, *theoria*	*sophia* = to seek a correct knowledge
Christian	*ens creatum* (the "divine fabric" – harmonious and orderly heaven and earth)	*What* an entity is, is the entity as conceived by God in the *intellectus divinus*	*That* something is depends on *actualitas*	*adaequatio*– measuring up to (*Anmessung an*) or being equal to God's ideas; faith and *doctrina*	to repent and strive for sainthood (i.e., perfect conformity to God's idea)
Modern	Material Nature (atoms)	*What* an entity is, is fixed by those features that render it calculable, verifiable and predictable	*That* something is depends on a substance that supports properties and causal interactions	Certainty of represen-tation	to seek mastery and to impose our will on the world

Technological	Resources (electricity, the internet)	*What* an entity is, is fixed by those features that enable us to unlock, exploit, and reconfigure entities (will to power)	*That* something is depends on always again bringing it into constant reserve, i.e., making constantly ready (eternal return)	Justice (*Gerechtigkeit*), "being produced as a configuration of the will to power" (GA6.2: 296 / N3 246)	to maximize options
		The Other Inception: **The Age of Adaptation**			
Post-Metaphysical	Things (a Black Forest farmhouse)	To be is to be conditioned by the fourfold, as earth, sky, mortals, and divinities wrestle adaptively with each other		unconcealment /concealment	to dwell

"abandonment of being" or the "forgetfulness of being" (see, e.g., GA67: 51). As beyng withdraws and lapses into forgetfulness, some particular kind of entity emerges as paradigmatic of what it means to be at all. These entities "give the measure" of being to everything else that shows up in the world. In the metaphysical age of the Greeks, for example, produced artifacts took the lead in shaping the understanding of being: entities, for the Greeks, were "always conceived of as producible and produced" (GA24:151). The medieval Christian epoch looked, not to the human context of production, but to the divine act of creation, in identifying entities as *ens creatum* (see GA27:78). For them, the heavens and the earth, manifesting the harmony and orderliness of God's handiwork, were paradigmatic entities. Everything showed up as belonging "within a specific rank of the order of what has been created" (GA5:90/ 68). The "modern philosophy from Descartes to Hegel," by contrast, "understands all entities in a thing-like manner, and takes the merely material thing of nature as the paradigmatic entity [*maßgebenden Seienden*]" (GA42:162). In the age of technology, it is resources – both raw and manufactured materials – that take the lead in shaping our understanding of being. Humans are paradigmatic of the technological understanding of being only to the degree that they show up as "human resources" (*Menschenmaterial*).

On the basis of a paradigmatic class of entities, an epoch identifies the principal aspects of the being of entities in general. It asks: given that such an entity is a paradigm of being, what is it to be an entity in general? A metaphysical age gives a two-part answer to that question: "being is distinguished into what-being and that-being. The history of being as metaphysics begins with this distinction and its preparation" (GA6.2:365/EP 2). Just as different entities stand out as paradigms at different moments in the history of metaphysics, there are corresponding differences in the understanding of what-being and that-being, of possibility and actuality.

(2) *Essence:* "what it is (*ti estin*) – what-being, *essentia*, possibility" (GA28:43). The possibilities an entity possesses, the possible relations into which it can enter, determine it as the thing that it is. In identifying those possible relations into which an entity can enter, essence defines the entity *as such*.

While the essential relations of each type of thing are particular to that type, each age has a common understanding of what demarcates the essential relations from the inessential ones. For the Greeks, it was the *idea*. For the moderns, the essential properties are those which allow us to calculate, and thus grasp rationally, the behavior of an entity. In the technological age, Heidegger argues, the essential properties are those that allow us to unlock, exploit, and reconfigure entities for "the greatest possible usage" (GA7:16/QCT 15).

(3) *Existence:* the question is whether "it respectively is or is not (*hoti estin*) – that-being, *existentia*, actuality" (GA28:43). Where essence is a matter of possibility and enabling, existence is a matter of actuality and causality (i.e., the way that present entities bear on each other). Driven by a desire for stability and predictability, metaphysics tries to identify in entities a non-relational ground that supports all of the relational properties and possibilities that define and constitute an entity as the kind of entity that it is. Existence enables entities to be present, and as such, existence is "the effectuating of constancy" (see GA6.2:377/EP 15).

A non-relational ground defines entities "as a whole" in a double sense. First, it characterizes each and every entity insofar as the entity is in being. Second, it supports the actual interrelations and fundamental connections that entities have to one another: entities "as a whole" are entities "with respect to their fundamental connection" (*Grundzusammenhang*) (see GA28:43).

That an entity is actually in being turns on some feature that marks off what is from what is not. Each metaphysical age has had a different sense of what this feature is, of what determines "*that* this entity is or is not" (GA6.2:364/EP 2). For Greek philosophy, existence was understood as *energeia*, the actuality of a completed product which is now fully present, that is, lacking nothing that would enable it to manifest itself. Later, the *Wirklichkeit* of entities was found in *actualitas* – in their capacity to act on and causally impact other entities. God, as the *actus purus*, informs the understanding of existence in the Christian epoch, for God is the maximally independent and stable presence and acts on every other entity. In modernity, actuality as causality manifests itself as the "standing-over-against of the object" (*das Entgegenstehen des Gegenstandes*; see GA41:161). In the technological age, finally, something exists if it is locked in the economy of the "eternal return" – if it is constantly being brought back and returned to the supply of resources, placed on call to be taken up and exploited again.

(4) *Truth*. When Heidegger discusses truth in the history of being, he is not primarily interested in the different theories that have been offered to explain what makes beliefs and assertions true. Rather, his focus is on the conditions under which entities can show what they really or truly are. This often manifests itself in the kind of things that inhabitants of the world do if they're trying to figure out what a thing really is – what sort of context do they set it in? What kind of questions do they ask of it?

For the Greeks, truth was *homoiôsis*, which Heidegger interprets as "adjustment," *Angleichung*. A true attitude is one that is adjusted in such a way that it can pick out what entities truly are: "all opening up of entities must be directed toward matching the paradigm (*Urbild*), toward conforming to the paradigm, to directing self according to the idea. Truth … now becomes *homoiosis* and *mimesis*, conformity, self-directing according to …, correctness of seeing, of perception as representing" (GA40:193/197). For the Greeks, *theôria* is the paradigmatic activity in which we achieve conformity with the truth, that is, with the ideas. Through theory, concerned as it is with the ideas or the conceptual structures of the world, our attitudes become shaped by the ideas. We thus learn to see the sensory world in terms of the ideas.

Because, in the Christian age, entities are *ens creatum*, the creations of God, what an entity truly or really *is* is the entity as it is thought of by God (see GA9:181/139). But the mind of God is not something that shows itself of its own accord. Rather, access to the truth requires our faith, that is, orienting ourselves to entities as God thinks them. Thus, correctness comes to be understood not as conforming ourselves to the self-disclosing truth, but as bringing ourselves into a fit state. The true attitudes are thus characterized in terms of *adaequatio*, which Heidegger translates as *Anmessung*, "fitting," "measuring up to" the revealed truth. The paradigmatic activities for getting our attitudes to fit or measure up to God's understanding are cognitive ones – belief in the revealed word, or the study and learning of church doctrine (see GA6.2:115/N4 88).

The Christian practice of securing our salvation by suiting or adapting our faculties to God's understanding is translated at the dawn of the modern age into a concern with the correct functioning of our rational capacities in order to secure the certainty of representation. Drawing a straight line from Luther's concern with a good conscience for securing salvation, to Descartes' imposition of rules for right reasoning, to Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* as the "essential delimitation of the correct and incorrect use of the human capacity for reason" (GA54:75–76), Heidegger concludes that in modernity, the true attitudes – the ones in which we see most perspicuously the truth of entities – are those in which we achieve certainty: "In order to reach what is true, [understood here] as what is right and correct, human beings must be

certain and secure of the right use of their basic abilities" (GA54:75). We know our faculties are functioning properly when we attain certainty – that is, when we can anticipate and predict the way entities will interact and events will unfold. Consequently, the true entity is "no longer an *ens creatum*, it is an *ens certum: indubitatum*" (GA6.2:147/N4 117).

(5) *The demand or claim*. In each age, Heidegger argues, inhabitants of the world experience themselves as called or drawn to respond to entities in a characteristic way. At the birth of the modern age, for instance, Heidegger argues that "the claim [*Anspruch*] of pure reason came to predominate" and the way entities appear changed accordingly: "the most general determinations of the being of what is are to be projected on the ground and with the guidance of the most universal principles of pure reason" (GA41:119). For a modern, the essential features of an entity are those in terms of which we can successfully reason about its interactions with other entities and thus secure it for scientific knowledge. But entities appeared in this way because the claim that characterized the Christian world – the demand to bring ourselves into perfect conformity with God's will – was replaced by a demand for emancipation to self-legislation and thus to mastery over the world. Reason is in the service of mastery (see GA5:106–07/81).

The transition from the modern to the technological world was driven by a new claim coming to predominate in our experience of the world. "In all technological happenings [*Vorgängen*]," Heidegger argues, "a sense rules, a sense which lays claim [*in Anspruch nimmt*] to human actions and omissions, and which was not first invented and made by human beings" (GA16:527/DT 55). What is characteristic of the technological age is not the demand or call to make everything knowable in accordance with the dictates of reason. Rather, the call that prevails is to reveal entities in terms of that about them which can render them reliably predictable so that all ends will be smoothly achievable. The demand is not concerned with any particular substantive aim or goal or purpose, but rather with so organizing the world as to serve any aim whatsoever. Technology, as Heidegger puts it, discloses entities as amenable to "planning, calculation, arranging, breeding," and it "makes demands on the entities that have come into its power in this way . . ., not with the intention of making progress toward a goal and 'ideal,' but rather for the sake of becoming itself" (GA66:26). A world in which everything shows up as organized "for the sake of *becoming*" is one in which no consequences are enduring, and in which no prior decisions constrain future actions – a world, that is, where we can at any moment revise our trajectory and revisit our choices. By arranging the world for the sake of becoming as such, technology discloses everything as an *option*. An option is something that can but need not be chosen. Moreover, choosing an option involves no genuine commitment to what is chosen. After the choice of one option, we are free to revisit the choice later and substitute another option for the one first selected. To "have options" is to retain our freedom.

* * *

Although there are significant changes from epoch to epoch, Heidegger identifies what we might call a network of common background assumptions which shape the metaphysical history of being from the Greek age through the modern. Although different metaphysical ages have identified different characteristics or traits as determinative of what entities truly are, each one of these characteristics was an effort to capture what was stable, and thus reliably and predictably encounterable in the world. Thus, a primary feature of metaphysics is the background assumption of constancy.

Within a metaphysical age, moreover, it is not simply the case that each true entity is stabilized into some way or other of being. Rather, the age achieves a kind of coherence insofar as all the true entities share a characteristic way of being. Thus, a second background assumption of metaphysics is that there is a prevailing uniformity that enables planning, a "uniformity of entities" (*Gleichförmigkeit des Seienden*) that underwrites a "uniformity of predictable calculation" (*Gleichförmigkeit der planbaren Rechnung*) (see GA7:95/EP 108).

A third metaphysical background assumption has to do with the human attitudes that give us the most lucid access to the truth of what entities are. Different metaphysical ages privilege different attitudes as best for discovering the truth about entities. But all of them privilege some propositional attitude or other as giving us the best access to the truth about entities – whether it be Greek *theôria*, Christian *doctrina*, or the *clara et distincta perceptio* of Descartes. This is not just a coincidence; the privileging of the cognitive attitudes is supported by the emphasis on stability in the material dimension of truth, for to be oriented toward what can be conceptually predicated of entities is to be oriented to what can stably and reliably be discovered in a variety of contexts and situations. Thus, the final background assumption of the metaphysics of truth is a thesis about *cognitivism* – namely, that the best attitude for grasping what things truly are is some species of cognitive attitude.

4   THE OTHER BEGINNING

Before the metaphysical age, when beyng was EMERGENCE, there was a plurality of different and potentially incommensurable ways of organizing any given situation, each with its own ends, characteristic activities, and styles. A polytheistic Greek, for instance, might get in tune with Hera and create a stable home, or get in tune with Aphrodite and make love, or get in tune with Ares and go to war, and so on. A good mortal in the age of emergence would need to have an openness to and the skills for quite different styles of comportment. In the metaphysical age, where beyng is machination, the world gets laid out in a uniform, stable, and universal style. Humans in a metaphysical epoch get in tune with a single style of being. This makes them able to anticipate what they will encounter, calculate consequences for particular actions, and resolve conflicts by appealing to an ordered hierarchy of principles. Each metaphysical age responds to a different but uniform claim – be it the drive for correct knowledge in the Greek world, repentance and sainthood in the Christian, world-mastery in the modern, or the maximization of options in the technological.

The final chapter in the history of beyng (*Seynsgeschichte*), Heidegger argues, will be an overcoming of the metaphysical age, with its insistence on a universal, stable, totalizing understanding of being. This will occur, Heidegger argues, when we humans, as participants in the disclosure of being, become adapted or fitted into adaptation itself: "the human being is as Da-sein ad-apted by beyng as adaptation, and in this way belongs to adaptation itself" (GA65:256).

In the age of *Ereignis*, entities will once again show up as transient and potentially incoherent. They will no longer endure as a result of some universal, uniform, and stable conception of being. Instead, they will be determined by entering into a local and particular configuration of other actual entities and possible relations (that is, within the FOURFOLD of the earth and sky, contingent and locally specific mortal practices and divinities). We mortals, for our part, will be malleable as we enter into situations, ready to abandon preconceived forms of responsivity. But unlike the earliest Greeks, we will find

our dignity in participating in beyng as disclosers of significance (rather than being at the mercy of the emergence of the gods). Unlike technological "functionaries of enframing," we will be receptive and poised to respond to demands that the situation might impose on us as we encounter *divinities* – sacred features or elements of the world. The divinities will remind us that we need to be responsive to and dwell in the situation around us, but in responding to it, we are only being pulled into a transient and local sense of the sacred. In Heidegger's words, ad-aptation is "that counter-swinging of beyng and Dasein, in which neither is an occurrent pole, but rather both are the pure vibration itself" (GA65:286–87). That is to say, in the age to come, there will be no rigid separation between ourselves and the relationships being established among entities: we will play an active part in constituting our world.

Mark A. Wrathall

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

History of metaphysics *(Geschichte der Metaphysik)* GA5:239/179; GA9:340/259; GA11:74/ID 67; GA15:326, 339, 379/FS 35, 43, 68; GA16:672 / HR 326; GA28: 29, 45, 278, 337; GA31:74; GA65:112, 174ff., 266, 295–96, 330, 424ff.; GA66:90, 193, 261ff.; GA67:43, 99, 138–39, 242, 250; GA68:21, 40, 81; GA69:94, 143; GA70:42

History of being *(Geschichte des Seins)* GA5:263/196, 266/198–99, 273/204, 364/275; GA9:314/240, 335/ 255, 339ff./258ff., 358/271–72, 377/286, 413/312; GA10:102/69; GA14:11–12; GA15:339/FS 43, 365ff.; GA65:158, 231; GA66:47, 130, 223, 367, 369, 396ff.; GA67:185, 221, 231, 234ff., 238ff., 249, 251, 255; GA69:73, 162; GA70:45, 149, 157, 173ff.; GA90:46, 109

History of beyng *(Geschichte des Seyns)* GA9:201/154; GA65:93, 119ff., 128, 177, 424, 430, 438, 443ff., 461, 465, 469, 494; GA66:15, 25, 49, 58, 68, 96, 193, 209, 224, 230ff., 237, 250, 283, 317ff., 338ff., 357, 365; GA67:7ff., 21ff., 33, 36, 39ff., 85, 97, 157; GA69:5ff., 15ff., 28ff., 88, 93ff., 116ff., 131ff., 150ff., 173, 179ff., 201ff., 213; GA70:45, 104–05, 169ff.; GA90:280ff.

FURTHER READING

Dreyfus 2017a, Okrent 2005, Rorty 1982, Thomson 2011a, 7–32, Wrathall 2018

HOLDING OUT (*AUFENTHALT*). SEE SOJOURN.

HOLDING (ITSELF, OUT (IN)) (*AUFHALTEN*). SEE SOJOURN.

104.
HOLY, THE (*DAS HEILIGE*)

Tнᴇ ʜᴏʟʏ ɪѕ the essential space of the divine, the dimension in which the gods appear (GA9:258/169).

Heidegger adopted the word "the holy" in the 1930s from Hölderlin. The word had a special importance for Heidegger because of the insights Hölderlin had given him into the proximity of тнɪɴᴋɪɴɢ and poetizing (see also Pᴏᴇᴛʀʏ). Heidegger understood from Hölderlin that the poet's task was that of naming the gods, but that in Hölderlin's time "holy names are lacking" (GA4:27/45). The gods had fled. Nevertheless, in consequence the poet learned and was able instead to name the realm to which the gods belonged: the holy. It is with the default of Gᴏᴅ that the holy emerges and the naming was, in Hölderlin's phrase, "compelled by the holy" (GA4:187/214).

In 1917 Rudolf Otto published his highly influential work *The Idea of the Holy*. For a time, discussion of the holy was dominated by it. Heidegger read the book with great interest and began to prepare a review of it from a phenomenological perspective in which what was essential to it was its constitution as an originary object that was the act-correlate of faith (GA60:332/252). However, during the 1920s, with Heidegger and Rudolf Bultmann as colleagues, Otto came to be seen by students as an anachronism. After Otto retired early from the university bemoaning *Being and Time* as the product of mental illness, the word "holy" was open for reappropriation by Heidegger.

Heidegger set out his richest account of the holy in his reading of Hölderlin's poem "As when on a holiday . . ." first published in 1943. This was the same year in which Heidegger wrote: "the thinker says being. The poet names the holy" (GA9:312/237). It is this relation between thinking and poeticizing that underlies his reading of the poem "As when on a holiday . . ." (GA4:49–77/67–99). The key verses from the poem read: "But now day breaks! I awaited it and saw it come, / And what I saw, may the holy be my word." Heidegger wrote that it is "only from the ᴛʀᴜᴛʜ of ʙᴇɪɴɢ" that the essence of the holy can be thought (GA9:351/267). By that he meant that what Hölderlin said with the word "holy" can be understood only in terms of an account of the ʜɪѕᴛᴏʀʏ ᴏꜰ ʙᴇɪɴɢ and the overcoming of ᴍᴇᴛᴀᴘʜʏѕɪᴄѕ of which Hölderlin was a precursor (GA52:143). Hölderlin's flight of the gods was to be understood to mean that the holy no longer gives to the poet holy names. This corresponds to the situation of the thinker who at the time of the end of philosophy, which is marked by the oblivion of being, is deprived of a word for being and so first learns that saying being is the task of thinking. The dimension of the holy is in the current epoch of the world and this is a sign that the open region of being is not cleared and that human beings are not near to the ᴄʟᴇᴀʀɪɴɢ (GA9:351–52/267).

From the poem "Bread and Wine" Heidegger took up Hölderlin's question "what are poets for?" and frequently cited his response that they are "like the wine-god's sacred priests who travel from land to land in holy night." Heidegger understood this to mean that the poet says the holy in unpropitious times as a way of singing to the trace of the gods who have fled (GA5:272/202). Nevertheless, the holy night is not simply an end. It is also a dawn in which the holy itself comes to language. Hölderlin's words "I awaited it and saw it come" are understood by

Heidegger to say that the holy, which is never given as object, is silently coming (GA4:67/89). Thus, for Heidegger, with the word "holy" Hölderlin not only announced the flight of the gods, he also announced the coming gods (GA4:47/64).

Robert Bernasconi

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA4:49–77/68–99, 103–51/126–72; GA9:337–52/257–68; GA13:231–35

FURTHER READING

Bernasconi 1985, 29–47, Gooch 2000, Mitchell 2015, 191–201

105.
HOMECOMING (*HEIMKEHR*)

Homecoming is the process of coming to belong to or "be at home" in one's own historical community and people. According to Heidegger's assertion in "Letter on 'Humanism,'" the homeland (*Heimat*) needs to be understood "not patriotically or nationalistically, but in terms of the history of being" (GA9:338/257). He discusses the homeland in the context of the homelessness (*Heimatlosigkeit*) of human beings in the modern era, and sees this homelessness as "the symptom of oblivion of being [*Seinsvergessenheit*]" (GA9:339/258). In Heidegger's thought, the homeland is essentially conceived of in terms of the DESTINY (*Geschick*) of the German PEOPLE; a people, however, that needs to be seen "in the context of a belongingness to the destiny of the West [*Abendland*]" (GA9:338/257).

Heidegger's main line of thought is that in order to become homely (*Heimischwerden*), one needs to go through an experience of the foreign. Hence, being at home does not mean making oneself comfortable in the cosiness of one's own, but the task of "becoming homely in being unhomely" (*Heimischwerden im Unheimischsein*) (GA53:143). Homecoming, understood in this way, is the profession of the poet. Consequently, Heidegger discusses this theme primarily in his lecture courses on Hölderlin. Hölderlin is not only conceived as "the poet's poet" (*der Dichter des Dichters*, GA4:34/52) but also as "the most German of the Germans" (*Deutscheste der Deutschen*, GA16:333). In fact, Hölderlin is "the poet of poets as poet of the Germans" (*Dichter des Dichters als Dichter der Deutschen*, GA39:214).

"Homecoming" translates both the German term *Heimkehr* and the term *Heimkunft*, which is the title of one of Hölderlin's poems in Heidegger's focus (GA4:9–31/24–49). The only significant treatment of the themes of home, homeliness, and homecoming not related to the interpretation of Hölderlin's poetry is Heidegger's discussion of homelessness as a basic attunement of Nietzsche's thought (GA50:115–27). In this entry, I will focus on the lecture course *Hölderlin's Hymn "The Ister"* from 1942 to show the strength of Heidegger's thought on homecoming and its potentially dangerous limitations.

In his elucidations on Hölderlin, Heidegger insists that dwelling "in what is one's own is what comes last and is seldom successful and always remains what is most difficult" (GA53:24); it requires "a passage through the foreign" (GA53:60). Heidegger links the flow of the "Ister" (the River Danube) as depicted in Hölderlin's hymn with the becoming homely of the human being. "Locality and journeying," which are "the poetic essence of the rivers," relate to being at home insofar as "finding one's own, and appropriating what one has found as one's own, is not that which is most self-evident or easiest but remains what is most difficult" (GA53:60). One's own is seen as the most difficult task and indeed as something that one is at risk of forever failing to achieve: "this *coming to be* at home in one's own in itself entails that human beings are initially, and for a long time, and sometimes forever, not at home" (GA53:60).

In Heidegger's history of being, the specific "own" at stake is *Germany*, and "the foreign" is not any foreign but identified as *Greece*: "*that* foreign, of course, through which the return home journeys, is not some arbitrary 'foreign' in the sense of whatever is merely and indeterminately

not one's own. The *foreign* that relates to the return home, that is, is one with it, is the *provenance* of such return and is that which has been at the commencement with regard to what is one's own and the homely. For Hölderlin, the Greek world is what is foreign with respect to the historical humankind of the Germans" (GA53:67).

Heidegger repeatedly refers to Hölderlin's letter to Böhlendorff of 4 December 1801 to justify this focus on a German homecoming *and* the identification of "the foreign" with the Greek world (GA39:291; GA52:130–31; GA53:153; GA75:357). Remarkably, this letter was written shortly before Hölderlin went on a journey to southern France. The hymn "Remembrance" ("Andenken") is Hölderlin's poetical greeting of Bordeaux. In his interpretation of this hymn, which he gave one semester prior to the lecture course on "The Ister," Heidegger "essentially translates Bordeaux into Greece and the ancient Greek world," as McNeill states, remarking that "the sidelining of Bordeaux and the heavy emphasis on 'the German' cannot but appear troubling" (McNeill 2013b, 231).

This troubling translation has not gone unnoticed. Lacoue-Labarthe speaks of Heidegger's "remythologization" of Hölderlin's poetry, against which he asserts that "'Andenken' speaks in reality, that is concretely, of Bordeaux" (Lacoue-Labarthe 2007a, 42). Adorno pointed to Heidegger's treatment of the lines from "Remembrance," in which Hölderlin refers to the brown women of Bordeaux, to make a similar point: whereas "Holderlin's lines are enraptured with the erotic imago of the Mediterranean woman," Heidegger responds to these lines with a "praise of German women, who are simply not the concern of the poem being explicated" (Adorno 1992, 118). This is a serious limitation: in restricting the passage through the foreign necessary for becoming homely to the interplay of Germany with ancient Greece, Heidegger fails to see the concrete foreignness present in Hölderlin's hymn.

Moreover, it appears that Heidegger does not take his own insight seriously enough. Consider his interpretation of the "colony." At first sight, "venturing into colony demands a peculiar not thinking of the home." But Heidegger continues with a revealing twist: "At the same time, however, such venturing in turn first bestows a thinking of the homely. This venturing is no mere leaving something behind but is already the first and therefore decisive act of return to the home" (GA53:166). A few pages earlier Heidegger defines the colony as "the land of the daughter that is related and drawn back to the motherland" (GA53:164), thereby undermining the radicality of his thought on homecoming by defining the foreign through what is one's home.

Gerhard Thonhauser

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Heimkehr GA4:79–151/101–74; GA6.2:358/N4 247; GA12:70/OWL 191–92; GA52:112, 174–91; GA53:67–68, 167; GA75:357
Heimkunft GA4:9–31/23–50; GA9:337–38/256–58; GA13:219; GA16:715–16; GA73.1:763; GA75:145–46, 357
Becoming homely GA4:24–25/43, 87/111–12, 129–38/151–60; GA52:168, 190; GA53:60–61, 143–52, 167–73, 178, 188

FURTHER READING

Trawny 2004

106.

HORIZON (*HORIZONT*)

Horizon (horizont) means "boundary" or "limit" and in this respect is the equivalent of the Greek *horismos*. The term appears throughout Heidegger's work, where it sometimes refers simply to the larger context within which an idea, doctrine, or inquiry is located, but more significantly (though in a way that is not unrelated) to the constituting boundary (*Grenze*) within and from which something appears or is disclosed (thus implying a productive rather than merely restrictive understanding of "boundary" itself). In *Being and Time*, Heidegger specifies the aim of the work as the "interpretation of time as the possible horizon for any understanding whatsoever of being" (SZ 1), and "horizon" is thus associated with notions of "projection" and transcendence." The problematic connotations of these ideas lead Heidegger away from the notion of horizon in the period after *Being and Time*. In the "Conversation on a Country Path about Thinking" (GA13:37–74; see also GA77:83–121/ 52–79), however, Heidegger focuses on the horizoning of the horizon itself, and so directly on a rethinking of horizon and horizonality, in a way that brings to the fore the spatial and topological connotations of these notions (especially their relation to notions of "the open" (*das Offene*), and "region," *Gegend/Gegnet*) – something reinforced by Heidegger's situating of the conversation as occurring on the country path. Although the term has a longer history, it is Husserl who first develops the idea of "horizon" (taking inspiration from William James's notion of "fringe") as a philosophically central concept. In Husserl, the horizon (differentiated into "inner" and "outer" horizons) operates in conjunction with the notion of intention as part of the determining structure of meaningful appearance. See also Place, Topology, the Between.

Jeff Malpas

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 1, 17–19, 166, 360–62, 421, 437; GA3:122; GA13:37–74/DT 58–90; GA14:35–37, 125–26; GA24:149–57/106–12, 210–18/147–54, 341/240–41, 434–38/306–08; GA29/30:188–89/125–26, 217–37/145–58, 252/170; GA77:83–121/52–79

107.
HUMAN BEING (*MENSCH*)

Human beings are the "guardians" of being, a task accomplished in thinking (GA9:315/239). Central to Heidegger's account of what it means to be a human being (*Mensch*) is his criticism of the Aristotelian notion of *animal rationale* (*zoon logon echon*). Heidegger transforms but does not dismiss the idea. While other discussions of the human condition centered in notions such as DASEIN, LIFE (*Leben*), or the mortals (*die Sterblichen*) put emphasis on other phenomena as defining human existence, notably DEATH, Heidegger's account of being human (*Menschsein*) focuses on our capacity for THINKING (*Denken*). In thinking, humans establish a relation to BEING; this relation is constitutive of all meaning accessible in LANGUAGE.

Thus Heidegger remains committed to some form of the claim that "thinking" or "rationality" determines being human. The most important contrast to this claim is the idea that humans are defined not by their thinking but by their will (*Wille*). Because humans understand themselves as defined by some nature, assumptions about human nature are intrinsically normative. It is the task of philosophy to critically examine this normative function, thereby offering humans successful ways of understanding themselves and their relation to entities.

The most extensive treatment of human being can be found in Heidegger's "Letter on 'Humanism.'" Humanism, in Heidegger's account, is "meditating and caring, that human beings be human and not inhumane, 'inhuman,' outside their essence" (GA9:319/244). Consequently, an account of human nature that defines both achievement of and deviation from the "ESSENCE" (*Wesen*) of being human is central to any form of humanism.

The most influential of such accounts is the idea that human beings are generically animals though animals of a specific, rational kind. In this view, rationality is some specifically human "addition" to animal nature. But this fails to account for the complete transformation of our "animal" nature through reason; it produces a distorted account of rationality, one in which reason is either circularly defined in opposition to irrationality (GA9:346/263) or human nature separated in parts such as soul (*Seele*) or mind (*Geist*) on the one hand and the "animal" body (*Leib*, *Körper*) on the other (GA9:324–30/246–52).

Heidegger's alternative to this view consists in seeing human existence united in the fact of EXISTENCE (or EK-SISTENCE, *Existenz/Ek-sistenz*) itself: "The human being is, and is human, insofar as he is the ek-sisting one" (GA9:350/266). As existing, humans are essentially exposed to actions, occurrences, and objects in their surrounding. Heidegger uses being (*Sein*), inter alia, to designate the unity and coherence of these different domains of what is. Since every action, occurrence, and object can be related to in thinking, thinking is said to be the general and fundamental way in which humans respond to any of them. It not only relates to particular entities; "thinking accomplishes the relation of being to the essence of the human being" (GA9:313/239).

This conception of thinking has consequences for Heidegger's ideas on action and language: analogous to his account of UNDERSTANDING (*Verstehen*) in *Being and Time*, thinking is taken not as a separate activity but as a cognitive moment that pervades all action. In particular,

thinking is not opposed to acting but rather the "simplest and at the same time the highest" action (GA9:313/239). Human thinking qua relating to being is irreducible to practical deliberation. What thinking "accomplishes" is a "letting" (*Lassen*, GA9:313/239; see REFLECTION) of entities. In granting access to intelligibility, thinking thus achieves something unspecific yet fundamental to all other human activities.

Heidegger describes this constitution of meaning with the help of a colloquial German expression: in thinking, "being comes to language" (GA9:313/239). If language is the medium of thinking as human nature, rationality as "having *logos*" (*logon echon*) cannot simply mean to be capable of producing meaning in addition to mere sounds. Human words and deeds rather display rationality in that they relate both to being and particular entities, thus placing them in logical space, i.e., in language.

When humans act and speak, being qua unity and coherence of what is must be implicitly understood. Since philosophy for Heidegger is defined by explicitly asking about being, this implies that some dormant form of philosophy is part of human existence: "to be human already means to philosophize" (GA27:3). In philosophy, human thinking reaches its specific intensity, making philosophy relevant for any account of human being.

Thus distinguishing a spectrum of different forms of thinking allows Heidegger to explain the range in which humans can either achieve or fail to achieve their essence: it is defined by *how* humans think. In line with the argument in the "Letter on 'Humanism,'" to take naively some account of human nature at face value violates the "philosophical" nature of man; it is more "human" to radically question the metaphysical assumptions of any such "humanist" account. Similarly, conceiving of thinking as an essentially voluntary action obscures human nature. Rather than assimilating thinking to willing (*Wille*), its self-referential nature should be made evident, such as in an explicit discourse on what human thinking is (GA77:1–157/1–104).

Tobias Keiling

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Human being and humanism GA9:313–64/239–76
Human being and metaphysics GA6.2:171–77, 215–20/N2 139–47, 183–88; GA45:148–50; GA65:48–54, 61, 312–18
Human being and thinking GA77:20–2213/14, 83–105/52–68, 146f./95
Human being and animality GA9:323–25/246–47; GA69:89
Human being in Kant GA3:214–31; GA41:246

FURTHER READING

Haar 1993, Olafson 1995, Wrathall 2013b

I

IDEA (*VORSTELLUNG*). SEE REPRESENTATION.

IDEATION (*VORSTELLUNG*). SEE REPRESENTATION.

IDEATIONAL REPRESENTATION (*VORSTELLUNG*). SEE REPRESENTATION.

108.
IDENTITY (*IDENTITÄT*)

HEIDEGGER DISTINGUISHES THREE different senses of what might be thought of as identity: sameness (*Selbigkeit*), identity (*Identität*), and equality (*Gleichheit*). Equality requires more than one element; a car, for instance, can only be equal to another thing if there are at least two cars (GA88:181). Equality enables each element to be for itself, separated from the other, in a mode of being without belonging together (GA77:39). Identity, on the other hand, is the indifference of oneness, an empty identity (*leere Selbigkeit*, GA 43:181). Sameness is neither the numerical identity of something with itself, nor the equality of separated elements, but a unity of what belongs together; sameness understood as belonging together implies difference (*Verschiedenheit*, GA31:194).

The main text in which Heidegger develops his notion of sameness is *The Principle of Identity* (GA11:31–50/ID 23–41). This text contains the published version of a lecture Heidegger gave in Freiburg in 1959 (GA79:115–29). It was part of a lecture series, which is now published in the *Gesamtausgabe* as *Freiburger Vorträge* (GA79:81–176). The series was under the heading "principles of thought" (*Grundsätze des Denkens*) and represents Heidegger's reflections on the three classical laws of thought: the principle of identity, the principle of contradiction, and the law of excluded middle.

In *The Principle of Identity*, Heidegger aims at finding out what identity is by thinking about this law. Heidegger starts with its usual formulation: A = A. What does this formula mean? The first answer is equality: "the formula expresses the equality of A and A. An equation requires at least two elements. One A is equal to another" (GA11:33/ID 23). It is obvious that this is not what the principle of identity is supposed to mean. It does not speak of two elements, but rather of the identity of one element with itself: "A is A, that is, every A is itself the same" (GA11:33/ID 24). This revised formula, however, still lacks what is essential, because it only names an abstract identity. With reference to German Idealism Heidegger asserts that sameness, even that of something with itself, "implies the relation of 'with,' that is, a mediation, a connection, a synthesis: the unification into a unity" (GA11:34/ID 25). Heidegger suggests a change of tone to understand this sameness: We need to read "A *is* A," hearing the principle of identity as saying something about the BEING of every entity: "it itself is the same with itself" (GA11:35/ID 26).

To further understand this sameness, Heidegger turns to Parmenides' fragment: τὸ γὰρ αὐτὸ νοεῖν ἐστίν τε καὶ εἶναι. Heidegger frequently discussed this fragment (GA5:90/68; GA7:140; GA8:244–47/240–44; GA9:477/361). The most detailed account is given in a short text published in the collection *Vorträge und Aufsätze* (GA7:237–61/EGT 79–101). In addition to frequent references, Heidegger devoted two lecture courses to Parmenides (GA35:103–96; GA54). In *The Principle of Identity*, Heidegger offers the following translation of Parmenides' fragment: "for the same perceiving (thinking) as well as being" (*das Selbe nämlich ist Vernehmen (Denken) sowohl als auch Sein*, GA11:36/ID 27). In contrast to the classic principle of identity,

which states that identity belongs to thought (or, in Heidegger's interpretation, to being), this fragment suggests that thought and being belong to an identity. They are "the same."

Heidegger interprets this sameness as "a belonging together" (*Zusammengehörigkeit*, GA11:36/ID 28). In the lecture series *The Principle of Reason*, Heidegger describes the path to an understanding of sameness beyond identity and equality as follows:

> thought in the sense of what in essence belongs together, the same indeed bursts the indifference of what belongs together, even more it holds them apart in the most radical dissimilarity; it holds them apart and yet does not allow them to fall away from each other and hence disintegrate. This holding-together in keeping-apart is a trait of what we call the same and its sameness. (GA10:133/89)

What is "the same" is neither separated in equality, nor unified in numerical identity, but rather a belonging together that bears difference.

To further understand this belonging-together, Heidegger adds another change of tone: Instead of stressing "together," in which case "to belong" comes to mean to be placed in an established order, Heidegger emphasizes "belonging," indicating that the "together" needs to be understood in terms of a belonging (GA11:37–38/ID 29). In Heidegger's view, the *belonging*-together is that of being and the human being: The human being belongs to being, because it is distinguished as the being who thinks; it is open to being and responding (*entsprechen*) to it. Being understood as becoming present (*Anwesen*), on the other hand, "needs the openness of a CLEARING, and by this need remains appropriated to human being" (GA11:39–40/ID 31). In short: "Man and being are appropriated [*übereignet*] to each other. They belong to each other" (GA11:40/ID 31–32).

The belonging together of being and human being can only be understood properly, if they are experienced as delivered over to each other (*einander ge-eignet*) in and through "ADAPTA-TION" (*Ereignis*) (GA11:45/ID 36). This experience is what Heidegger considers lost in the modern age of TECHNOLOGY, and he suggests that a leap is required to enable it again (GA11:41/ID 32). We receive the tools for such an entry into "adaptation" from LANGUAGE: "for language is the most delicate and thus the most susceptible OSCILLATION holding everything within the suspended structure of adaptation" (GA11:47/ID 38).

Gerhard Thonhauser

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA10:133/89; GA11:31–50/ID 23–41; GA27:92–100; GA36/37:57–58; GA42:84–88, 132–36; GA77:39–40; GA78:268–70; GA79:81–96, 115–29; GA88:219–22

109.
IDLE TALK (*GEREDE*)

"I DLE TALK" DENOTES the fallen and inauthentic form of DISCOURSE. Heidegger defines discourse as the "articulation of intelligibility" and as "the 'significant' structuring of being-in-the-world" (SZ 161).[1] Discourse is, along with DISPOSEDNESS and UNDERSTANDING, an EXISTENTIAL that ineluctably characterizes DASEIN as the human form of life. All authentic ways of being have corresponding fallen forms, as Heidegger already makes clear in §27 of *Being and Time* in relation to his reflections about everyday Dasein and the Dasein that exists inauthentically as the ANYONE (*das Man*).

To begin with, ambiguity, curiosity, and idle talk are, as the "inauthentic" counterparts of the existentials of disposedness, understanding, and discourse, similarly ineluctable; that is, they belong necessarily to human life. Whoever is as Dasein, is fallen. FALLING is a structural moment of Dasein, for which the individual cannot be made responsible or held to account. This lack of accountability is one of the essential reasons for Heidegger distancing himself from "a moralizing critique of everyday Dasein and the aspirations of a philosophy of culture" (SZ 167). To let oneself drift in the flow of public interpretation; to say what one says and write what one writes (idle talk, idle scribbling); to notice what one notices (curiosity); to be unable to determine what truly belongs to oneself and what one only experiences as belonging to oneself by means of an unreflective participation in an inherited stock of institutionalized practices (ambiguity) – these make human beings what they are, whether they want this or not. Heidegger's analyses understand themselves first and foremost as purely descriptive precisely because humans cannot always and in all circumstances choose between the authentic shaping of their lives ("AUTHENTICITY") and the more or less conformist form of life ("inauthenticity").

The status of the analyses of falling is, however, controversial. While Heidegger's reflections about the falling of Dasein have often been understood in the sense of a radical cultural critique, one that at first appears to let itself be placed in an unbroken continuity with the critique of alienation found within the civilization-critical literature of the early decades of the twentieth century, he himself resisted an understanding of this kind very decisively: "The expression 'idle talk' [and this counts for the analyses of falling as a whole – C.D.] should here not be used in a disparaging sense. Terminologically, it refers to a positive phenomenon that constitutes the mode of being of everyday Dasein's understanding and interpretation" (SZ 167). Although the use of expressions such as "idle talk" (also "idle scribbling," cf. SZ 169), "curiosity," and "ambiguity" often seems to be accompanied by a negative valuation, and even though Heidegger's self-disclosures cannot always be trusted, it should be noted that according to Heidegger's self-understanding the analyses of falling proceed from a value-neutral perspective.

How can the structure and function of idle talk be explicated more precisely? In a course of lectures entitled *Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy*, Heidegger makes a rather unusual suggestion for rendering the content of the Greek definition of the human being as ζῷον

---

[1] All translations of *Sein und Zeit* in this section are by Marilyn Stendera.

λόγον ἔχον. He elucidates this expression with the phrase: "The human is a living being that reads the newspaper" (GA18:108). A few lines later, he remarks: "if discourse is the authentic possibility of Dasein, in which it unfolds itself, and does so concretely and for the most part, then this very speaking is also the possibility in which Dasein *ensnares* itself – Dasein in an idiosyncratic tendency of unfolding in, and letting itself be led from, immediacy, fashion, and mere drivel" (GA18:108).

The remarks in the cited passage shed light upon Heidegger's view of idle talk, entirely independently of the question of whether his understanding of the Greek conception of the human being as ζῷον λόγον ἔχον is apt. As speaking beings, humans are compelled to make use of an inherited language, take up common ways of speaking, and first attain an understanding of their world and themselves through the medium of public pre-understandings and socio-culturally shaped patterns of perceiving and thinking. The expressions that are used to articulate these understandings are – like language as a whole – constrained through public factors that are external to individuals. These restrictions as such do not yet lead to Dasein ensnaring itself in idle talk, which Heidegger after all explicitly distinguishes from discourse. The adherence to culturally and socially shaped guidelines only turns into idle talk when one does not work through their contents, does not make them one's own, and orients oneself according to what is said instead of turning one's attention toward a subject-matter and placing oneself in a relationship to it. "Idle talk" is Heidegger's name for the unthinking reproduction of something that is usually characterized by a lack of expertise and proficiency. Heidegger's warning in the Aristotle lectures is instructive: one takes up something from the paper or other media, one says what one heard without understanding anything of the question at hand, repeats it, passes it on, "without first appropriating the matter" (SZ 169). It is a case of idle talk, then, when there is a lack of knowledge and the subject-matter is, and remains, alien to one. Here, one can think of the thoughtless exchange of political convictions, vocalizations while attending a concert, or a conversation about the attractions of Indian cuisine, insofar as one is not really familiar with the respective fields. Not even the sciences (including the discipline of philosophy) are free from this, as Heidegger observes: "for everything that can be done there will nowadays first be a conference.... So today there are people who travel from one conference to the other while being conscious of something actually happening, and of them having done something; whereas one has in reality avoided work, has sought to accommodate one's own – albeit misunderstood – helplessness within idle talk" (GA20:376).

Repeating something without having developed one's own thorough understanding of a matter and the appropriate sense for a subject is the defining feature of idle talk, regardless of whether it occurs in the base utterances of everyday culture or elaborate scientific disquisitions. Thus Heidegger remarks in *Being and Time*: "in accordance with the average intelligibility that is already within the language that is spoken when it is expressed, the communicated discourse can to a large extent be understood without the listener taking up a primordially-understanding being towards that which is talked about.... And because discoursing has lost, or never even won, the primary relation of being to the talked-about entity, it communicates itself, not in the manner of the primordial appropriation of this entity, but in the way of *talking on* and *parroting*" (SZ 168). It must be noted, however, that in its unavoidability idle talk also functions as the starting point for the genuine working through and appropriation of something. Heidegger comments: "We come to know many things in this way first.... Dasein can never withdraw itself from the everyday way of interpreting into which it grows first. All genuine understanding, interpretation and communication, rediscovery and new appropriation, are brought about in it and from it and

against it" (SZ 169). And it is because of this that Heidegger can assert that his analyses of falling understand themselves as descriptive first of all. Understood in this way, participation in idle talk seems in effect to be a precondition for taking the further step of engaging thoroughly with a subject-matter and attaining one's own understanding thereof.

Heidegger's analyses of discourse as an existential raise the question of whether, and to what extent, discourse is to be understood as an exclusively linguistic phenomenon. Although such an understanding strongly suggests itself in view of the German expression *Rede*, with which one refers primarily to various forms of oral vocalization and expression exchanged in the context of a natural language, it should be kept in mind that Heidegger uses the expression in a technical sense and deviates from the way it is commonly understood. Words do not necessarily belong to discourse, insofar as discourse can also manifest itself in acting and behaving. The same could also be asserted in a philosophical sense about idle talk. Responses to things and situations, and dealings with these, can be superficial and occur without closely taking into account the respective factors salient to the matter. Dealing with something does not yet guarantee its appropriation. Proceeding from Heidegger's own expansion of the ways of being of idle talk, such as when he speaks of "idle scribbling" (SZ 169), one could speak of "idle doing," "idle making," and so forth. Heidegger himself, however, seems to think primarily of linguistically articulated forms of idle talk, although in the context of his reflections he hints throughout that the determination of human Dasein through the public way of interpretation can also be located in the pre-linguistic realm: "the dominion of the public way of interpretation [that also, among other ways, articulates itself in idle talk – C.D.] has already decided even about the possibilities of having a mood, that is, about the fundamental way in which Dasein lets the world matter to it" (SZ 169–70).

In any case, it is undeniable that idle talk as a form of falling presupposes the context of a linguistic form of life, even if it does not always manifest itself linguistically. The role that assertoric sentences play within the framework of idle talk is, however, open to question. Does idle talk only exist in the context of a form of life for which the use of assertoric sentences is constitutive (cf. Brandom 2002a), or is this not the case because idle talk can manifest itself independently thereof (cf. Haugeland 2005)? An answer to this question depends on whether one views language as constitutive for the human form of life, and on the sense in which one understands such constitution.

<div align="right">*Christoph Demmerling*</div>

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 126–30, 160–80, 349–50; GA18:108; GA20:361–91

FURTHER READING

Adrián Escudero 2013, Brandom 2002a, Haugeland 2005, Hirsch 1978, Höfner 2008, 227ff., 255ff., Thomann 2004, 35–80, Wrathall 2011, 95–118

ILLUMINATE, ILLUMINATION (*LICHTEN, LICHTUNG*). SEE CLEARING.

ILLUSION (*SCHEIN*). SEE SEEMING.

ILLUSORY APPEARANCE (*SCHEIN*). SEE SEEMING.

110.
IMAGINATION (*EINBILDUNG/ EINBILDUNGSKRAFT*)

Imagination has typically been understood in the Western philosophical tradition as a faculty of the mind or soul that allows it to use the matter previously delivered to it in inner or outer perception (reflection or sensation) to create novel images (broadly understood so as to include the visual, the tactile, the emotional, etc.) which it beholds within itself. Imagining thus involves both a productive act in which the image is created, and a passive, quasi-perceptual relationship to the image itself. Immanuel Kant, in the *Critique of Pure Reason* (1781/87), took over this idea of imagination as a creative faculty and claimed further that it is the "common root" of the two other main faculties of the mind, sensibility (our intuitive/receptive capacity) and understanding (our conceptual/spontaneous capacity) (A15/B29, A78/B103). Heidegger, in his writings on Kant in the late 1920s, essentially accepts Kant's account of imagination as the Ur-faculty of the mind, but he tries to clarify and deepen Kant's account of how imagination can *be* the root of the other faculties. In doing so he identified it with what he had argued in *Being and Time* was the self-constituting temporal structure of human existence (Dasein), and he claimed it was the source of ontological cognition (our understanding of being) as well.

In Kant's anti-empiricist account of empirical cognition, the exercise of both sensibility and understanding takes place on the basis of certain a priori *forms*, those of pure space and time, on the one hand, and the pure concepts of understanding (categories), on the other. This gives rise to two main problems: where these a priori forms come from, given that they can't come from sensory experience or otherwise be given to the mind from without; and how they may be unified, given their heterogeneous character (i.e., the fact that there are different kinds of unities and operation – intuitive and discursive, passive and active – involved in each).

Much of the reception of Kant has focused on developing different possibilities for solving the second of these problems. Heidegger's neo-Kantian opponents tended to elevate the spontaneous conceptual capacities that are involved in pursuing rational, systematic knowledge of the world in natural science, in the process treating pure space and time as concepts, and thereby effectively turning our intuitive capacity into a conceptual one. Heidegger, however, wanted to preserve the distinction between thought and intuition, and to emphasize that, as finite beings, we must be *affected* by objects or entities, prior to any conceptual, rational, scientific systematization of our experience of them. This requires holding on to the fundamental distinction between space and time as forms of intuition and categories as forms of thought. To deal with the problem of the heterogeneity of intuition and thought, then, and at the same time to show the source of the a priori forms of each, Heidegger developed his "violent" interpretation (GA3:202), according to which we *produce* the forms of cognition, both intuitive and discursive, through "transcendental" imagination in such a way that the production generates their a priori unity. Transcendental imagination is thus, like empirical imagination as it was traditionally understood, a capacity for "self-affection" (*Selbstaffektion*)

that is both receptive and creative. What it creates, however, are neither *objects* (as divine or "original" intuition would) nor *empirical* representations of objects, but rather the pure, a priori *forms* of objects, on the basis of which we are able to take particular empirical things to *be* objects for us at all.

Now, on Heidegger's account, SPACE, TIME, and the categories are the interrelated structures by which I, as a mind, hold on to that which is empirically given to me, retaining that which I *have* experienced and anticipating what I *will* experience. This much was arguably clear to Kant himself. Heidegger goes a step further, however. He understands the activity of transcendental imagination (which produces these forms, and so enacts the retaining and projecting of the manifold of sensibility) to be the activity by which we constitute *ourselves*. For, in producing the forms of temporal and spatial manifolds, and so enabling ourselves to reidentify objects within them under their general, conceptual aspects, imagination holds together what has been with what will be. All of this, however, is *for* the subject, who also locates herself as a self-identical, determinate empirical entity in those very same manifolds. Time is thus not, as Kant had said, just a form in which objects are ordered in "inner sense," it is rather the very structure of subjectivity affecting and so continually generating itself as a being in the world (GA3:§34; GA25:150ff., 395ff.). And the activity of imagination is thus, even though Kant himself didn't realize it (and couldn't because he still thought of time as a sequence of "nows"), the very activity of the "temporalizing of TEMPORALITY" (*Zeitigung der Zeitlichkeit*) that Heidegger had obscurely described as the deepest ontological dimension of Dasein in *Being and Time* (SZ 304).

Though Heidegger had critics from the beginning (most notably Ernst Cassirer), perhaps the most serious challenge to his reading of Kant has come from Dieter Henrich, who emphasized that for Kant the *unknowability* of the origin, the "common root," of sensibility and understanding, was essential – it was part of the rejection of the overreaching rationalism of the Leibnizians. Instead, Henrich argues, the unity of the faculties must be understood as *teleological* – we can't *know* the unity, as Heidegger's account of imagination implies we can; rather we must work to *bring it about*, by working to make sense of what the senses deliver in light of the demands of reason.

Though Heidegger had the philosophical resources to counter this objection, he never responded to Henrich, nor did he work out how all understanding of being – not just that of "occurrent" objects conceptualized categorially, as we get in Kant – might be understood as "imaginative." Some further discussion of imagination may be found in his lectures on German Idealism (GA28), where he considers the extent to which Fichte's and Hegel's discussions of imagination in Kant differ from his own, but the term largely drops from his lexicon as he develops his thought out of and away from the systematic project of the late 1920s (though he did republish the Kant-book multiple times throughout his career). Nevertheless, the idea that we must somehow *actively* work to *let* that which is be *for* us, is an idea Heidegger never ceased exploring, and so it is possible to see most of Heidegger's corpus as developing the idea he finds in Kant of the fundamentally imaginative character of finite human existence.

Matthew Shockey

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Discussion of Kant and imagination GA3; GA21; GA24; GA25; GA28; GA31; GA41; the first of these has the most extensive discussion of imagination and is the primary basis for this entry
"Violent" interpretation of Kant GA3:202

Self-affection GA3:§34; GA25:150ff., 395ff.; cf. GA24:187ff. on moral "self-feeling" (*Sichfühlen*)
Subjectivity and temporality GA3:§34; SZ 304

FURTHER READING

Crowell 2001a, Crowell and Malpas 2007, Dahlstrom 2010, Dahlstrom 1991, Declève 1970, Elliott 2005, Golob 2013, Henrich 1994, Remington 2012, Rockmore 2000, Shalow 1992, Sherover 1971, Stevenson 2012, Weatherston 2002

IMMENSE (*RIESIG*). SEE GIGANTIC.

IMMERSION (*AUFGEHEN*). SEE EMERGENCE.

IMPORT (*BEDEUTUNG*). SEE MEANING.

IN FACT (*FAKTISCH*). SEE FACTICITY.

IN-CEPTION (*ANFANG*). SEE INCEPTION.

111.
IN-TERMS-OF-WHICH (*WORAUFHIN*)

FOR HEIDEGGER, UNDERSTANDING always involves something like a point of view, which provides that in terms of which (*woraufhin*) we make sense of something. To make sense of a person's behavior, for example, one might view their actions *in terms of* their responses to incentives, *in terms of* their genetic make-up, or *in terms of* their suppressed desires. In the first of these cases, responses to incentives would be the *in-terms-of-which* (*Woraufhin*) of the interpretation. The overarching aim of *Being and Time* is to gain clarity on the in-terms-of-which of being (SZ 324).

Heidegger is fond of the German phrase *in Hinblick worauf* which can mean "in view of," or "in terms of." In light of this phrase, Heidegger adopts as technical terms the standalone nouns *Hinblick*, *Woraufhin*, and *Worauf*. Both *Woraufhin* and *Worauf* (without the particle *hin*) can be translated as "[the] in-terms-of-which," and should be understood alongside the visual imagery that Heidegger associates with these terms. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger explains that INTERPRETATION is grounded in a fore-sight (*Vorsicht*), which provides a point-of-view (*Hinsicht*) with regard to which (*im Hinblick worauf*) something is to be interpreted (150). So Heidegger argues that interpretation requires a pre-view (*Hinblick*) of the in-terms-of-which (*Woraufhin*) of the interpretation.

Heidegger provides his best illustrations while discussing Kant in his 1925–26 lecture course on logic. In this course, Heidegger explicitly treats an in-terms-of-which as a principle for ordering:

> suppose we have a bunch of spheres of different sizes and made of different kinds of kinds of material – and suppose they are to be ordered. The bunch of spheres is unordered, and the task is to sort them out and group them. But how? The assignment – "The spheres are to be ordered" – is insufficiently defined because nothing has been said about what the job entails. We know the unordered is to be ordered, but the question is: in terms of what [*im Hinblick worauf*]? (GA21:284)

Heidegger goes on to explain that if we are to order the spheres, we need a pre-view of the in-terms-of-which that will serve as an ordering principle. If the in-terms-of-which were color, for example, we could order the spheres by grouping them according to color.

But the deeper question in this lecture course is about the in-terms-of-which of "order *qua* order" (GA21:275). In other words, Heidegger is searching for a principle or in-terms-of-which that allows a manifold of experience to present itself as order*able*, or *susceptible of ordering*. Heidegger asks his students to imagine a person who wants to put his papers in order but doesn't yet have a principle for doing so. In this case, he would be "looking for a principle" in terms of which he could order the papers (GA21:275). On Heidegger's view (or at least on Heidegger's reading of Kant), the papers show up as susceptible of ordering only under a pre-view of order qua order, i.e., "pure succession – that is to say: *time*" (GA21:275). In other words, TIME is the in-terms-of-which of orderability: things present themselves as orderable in terms of time.

Although Heidegger never offers a sustained discussion of the "in-terms-of-which" in *Being and Time*, the expression appears (in some grammatical form) in several of its most important passages, including Heidegger's characterizations of BEING (SZ 6), world (SZ 86), MEANING or

significance (*Bedeutsamkeit*, SZ 143), and SENSE (*Sinn*, SZ 151, 324). For example, Heidegger introduces the concept of "world" in the following way:

> that wherein Dasein understands itself beforehand in the mode of assigning itself is the in-terms-of-which [*Woraufhin*] of letting entities be involved beforehand. The "wherein" of an act of understanding which assigns or refers itself, is the in-terms-of-which [*Woraufhin*] of letting entities be encountered in the kind of being that belongs to involvements; and this "wherein" is the phenomenon of the world. (SZ 86)

Here Heidegger explains that the in-terms-of-which of AVAILABLE entities is the world. So just as the spheres could be ordered or unordered in terms of color, it's in terms of the world or an equipmental context that available entities *belong* somewhere, or carry their particular affordances.

It's worth noting that Heidegger most frequently uses the term "in-terms-of-which" as a relative adverb, rather than a noun. Examples include Heidegger's important introductions to *being* (SZ 6) and *significance* (SZ 143). Depending on the context, the adverb *woraufhin* can be translated as "whereupon," "upon which," "in terms of which," or "on the basis of which." Macquarrie and Robinson opt for the latter when Heidegger introduces *being*: "what is asked about is being . . . that on the basis of which [*woraufhin*] entities are already understood" (SZ 6). But as the translators point out, it's more natural to render *woraufhin* as "upon which" when it appears in connection with the verb "projection" (e.g., "that upon which [*woraufhin*] it projects – that is to say possibilities," SZ 45).

This raises the possibility of translating *Woraufhin* – as Heidegger's noun construction – as "upon-which" rather than "in-terms-of-which," especially when the noun appears in proximity to "projection." For example, Macquarrie and Robinson render Heidegger's definition of sense (*Sinn*) as follows:

> sense [*Sinn*] is the "upon-which" [*Woraufhin*] of a projection in terms of which [*aus*] something becomes intelligible as something. (SZ 151)

One thing complicating this passage is that Heidegger uses *aus* in the same way as he might have used *woraufhin* (see also SZ 324). But setting this aside, whether to render *Woraufhin* as "upon-which" or "in-terms-of-which" in a particular passage is largely a matter of what Heidegger is trying to emphasize. When we project X upon Y, the Y is both the "upon-which" of the projection and the "in-terms-of-which" of X. For example, an available entity is projected upon the world (*auf Welt hin entworfen*, 151), so the world is both the "upon-which" of the projection and the "in-terms-of-which" of the available entity. And since TEMPORALITY is the sense of being, that means we project being upon temporality, i.e., temporality is that in terms of which we make sense of being.

Kevin Gin

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 6, 45, 86, 143, 150–51 324–25; GA21:275, 284; GA24:392, 396–402; GA63:38 (for an early use of *Woraufhin*)

FURTHER READING

McManus 2012, 111–16, 129, 132

INABIDING (*INSTÄNDIGKEIT*). SEE STEADFASTNESS.

112.
INCEPTION (*ANFANG*)

A N INCEPTION IS a self-grounding, fundamental set-up, or initial orientation that remains formative throughout everything which results from the initial orientation. "Inception," in German *Anfang*, is Heidegger's translation of the pre-Socratic term *arche* (GA9:247/189). "The genuine inception is always a leaping-ahead, a leaping-ahead in which everything to come is already leapt over, even if as something veiled. Concealed within itself, the inception contains already the end" (GA5:64/48). In the situation of the not yet founded orientation, inception is the process of self-capturing (*Sich-auf-fangen*) in the sense of grabbing hold of the orientation by the orientation itself. Inception is a process of self-foundation (GA70:10). This stabilizing effect is the cause of the long-lasting impact of the inception notwithstanding its inevitable ungroundedness. In this respect, an inception is different than a mere starting point or beginning (*Beginn*) of a historical development.

Inception is one of the major concepts in Heidegger's history of beyng (see HISTORY OF BEING). The concept is differentiated in the paradigmatic "first inception" of Greek thought and the yet to come "other inception."[1] The "first inception" which Heidegger identifies with pre-Platonic[2] thinking (GA5:263/196) and poetizing (GA9:312/238) grasps being as ALÊTHEIA (TRUTH) and *phusis* (nature). It determines all occidental orientations including those of the currently prevailing technological era. The "other inception" is a new orientation that accounts for the possibility to set up non-metaphysical fundamental orientations. Heidegger speaks in this respect of an "initiating ESSENCE of historical humanity" (*anfangendes Wesen des geschichtlichen Menschen*, GA5:111/84). He explicitly devotes his THINKING to the preparation for the "other inception" (GA65:10, 13).

According to Heidegger, the first inceptive orientation is a violent path-laying (*Bahnen*). Subsequently, human beings "are continually thrown back on the paths that they themselves have laid out; they get bogged down in their routes [*Bahnen*], get stuck in ruts [*Gebahntem*], and by getting stuck they draw in the circle of their world, get enmeshed in seeming, and thus shut themselves out from BEING" (GA40:166 ff./168). The figure of the laid-out paths lends additional plausibility to the lasting impact of the inceptive orientation. "Way-making [*Bahnung*] goes before and yet, as the incipient, remains behind by itself" (GA51:108). At the same time, it is "the unity of those paths [*Bahnen*] and relations in which birth and death, disaster and blessing, victory and disgrace, endurance and decline acquire for the human being the shape of its DESTINY" (GA5:27f./20f.). Therefore, Heidegger groups initiating (*anfangen*), bestowing, and grounding to the threefold sense of founding truth (*Stiftung der Wahrheit*, GA5:63/47).

---

[1] In his *Ponderings* (GA94), Heidegger initially writes "second" instead of "other" inception. He later abandoned this formulation, most probably because to him there is no meaningful "third inception" (cf. GA70:12).

[2] Sometimes Heidegger explicitly rejects the designation "pre-Socratics" or "pre-Platonics" for Anaximander, Parmenides, and Heraclitus. Plato or Aristotle did neither finish "pre-Socratic" thinking, nor are they defectors of the first inception (cf. GA71:61).

It is especially a characteristic of the first inception that "like in a first leap, but also just for a moment – being itself is thought here" (GA51:111/missing in the English translation) by some of the pre-Socratics. Yet, the inception is not only a new way of thinking. It is also "being itself" (GA51:117). In order to demonstrate this further identity, Heidegger indicates the element of necessity (*Notwendigkeit*) or compelling EMERGENCY (*nötigende Not*) within the inception (*ibid*.). Necessity and emergency go along with the set-up of orientations since these orientations rely on each other and need to build up a system of coherent and stable references. Necessity and emergency are elements of the "enjoinment of the PRESENCING of what presences in each case" (*ibid*.). "Enjoinment" is another Heideggerian translation of the Greek notion *arche* (GA51:123). Accordingly, Heidegger writes that enjoinment "*is the inception*" and "incipiently, being '*is*' enjoinment" (*ibid*.). This enjoinment has to be conceptualized as a permanent process, so that "all ESSENCE is essencing" (*alles Wesen ist Wesung*, GA65:66).

The important role of necessity and emergency is not inconsistent with the fundamental FREEDOM which characterizes the inception. In fact, being as enjoinment "repels all limits in the sense of duration. . . . Only thus is the inception the inception, which can only presence in being incipient. However, as a returning into itself the inception is the most concealed. All of this first reveals when thinking is incipient once again" (GA51:123).

The concealment of the initial freedom which is imminent in the first inception is its decisive flaw. Here, essencing is not grasped as an ongoing process and, therefore, changes its character. "Essencing – without being grasped as such – is presencing" (GA65:189). In other words, the incipience (*Anfänglichkeit*) of essencing loses its persistence as soon as present orientations determine the way of orienting. This happens in the first inception when essence is grasped as presencing of some immutable transcendent idea or general being. "The persistence cannot find grounds in the first inception, since the first inception still conceals the incipience" (GA70:27f.). Persistence of an inception on the other hand is "the non-abandoning of the incipience. . . . The inceptive essence of persistence consists in the recurrence to the inception" (*ibid*.). Since inception was not acknowledged as creative in the first inception it "created the domain in which the representing of entities as such later came to prevail and in which the abandonment by being then unfolded in ever greater concealment" (GA65:64; see ABANDONMENT OF BEING).

In order to avoid the defect of the first inception, the other inception is its "more original repetition." Yet, the REPETITION of the other inception varies from the conditions which define the repeatability of an experiment such as "constancy of circumstances" and "universally valid demonstrability" (GA65:166). "In the other inception is the first inception more inceptive and precisely never finished" (GA70:64). Therefore, the other inception has to differ from the first (GA71:227). Their respective uniqueness defines what is "outstanding" (*das Ragende*) and separates inceptions but also inceptive thinkers by unbridgeable "fissures."

Heidegger's entire thinking of the history of beyng is driven by the problem: how to make the transition (*Übergang*) or LEAP (*Sprung*) from the first to the other inception happen? He discards a revolution (GA67:39) or counter-movement (GA65:186f.) against the first inception because every inversion remains entangled in what it inverts. Rather, Heidegger wants to transform the REMEMBRANCE (*Erinnerung*) of the first inception into anticipatory thinking (*Vordenken*) of the other inception. "Remembering of the first inception is anticipatory thinking in what cannot be thought in anticipation [*das Unvordenkliche*] of the other inception" (GA70:66). This transformation has a destructive element. Heidegger mentions the "destruction of *idea – ousia – apriori –* transcendence" (GA94:213). But at the same time, advancing toward the other inception, which

is the downgoing of the first inception, comes from an intimacy with it (GA70:91) and needs to erect what stands out in it (GA65:179).

Remembrance of the original thinking and inceptive thinking in general are the preparation for the other inception which then is "BEYNG itself as ADAPTATION, the concealed sovereignty of the origin of the truth of being as such" (GA65:58). Heidegger sees the "conversation with the history of Western thinking" as a "step back" which "leads us away from what has been thought so far in philosophy" and toward "what has always remained unasked throughout this history of thinking" (GA11:59/ID 50). In this sense, inceptive thinking further develops the phenomenological method.

Christian Schmidt

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

First inception and alêtheia/phusis GA65:188–91, 329–31; GA70:22; GA71:14f., 25–29, 67–69
Beginning vs. inception GA39:3f.; GA54:9–12; GA70:57; GA71:68
The other inception as more original GA40:42/41; GA65:57f., 475, 504; GA70:11
Fissure GA39:52; GA65:185f., 278f, 412; GA70:12, 15, 61
Anticipatory thinking and the other inception GA65:338; GA70:53; GA71:14f.

FURTHER READING

Schürmann 1990, Keiling 2015

INDICATE, CALL ATTENTION (*ANZEIGEN*). SEE FORMAL INDICATION.

INDICATION (*ANZEIGE*). SEE FORMAL INDICATION.

INDIVIDUATE, INDIVIDUATION (*VEREINZELN, VEREINZELUNG*). SEE INDIVIDUALIZATION.

113.
INDIVIDUALIZATION (*VEREINZELUNG, VEREINZELN*)

"I NDIVIDUALIZATION" IS WHAT happens to DASEIN when, in the grip of ANXIETY, it can no longer understand itself in terms of the inherited and taken for granted public intelligibility of the everyday WORLD, thus opening up the possibility of authentic SELFHOOD. Although it is part of an experience of profound disorientation, being individualized puts Dasein in a position to appreciate the active role played by the individual in sustaining his or her own commitments and participating in the intelligibility of the everyday world.

By and large, according to Heidegger, each individual Dasein lives a life shaped by its familiarity with the standards and norms of what "ANYONE" (*Man*) does in its everyday social milieu. This everyday intelligibility has a pre-reflective authority that gives it self-evidence and an air of being a natural fact. Yet, in the mood of anxiety, "everyday familiarity collapses" (SZ 188). This collapse "brings Dasein back from its absorption in the 'world'" (SZ 189) and "takes away from Dasein the possibility of understanding itself, as it falls, in terms of the 'world' and the way things have been publicly interpreted" (SZ 187).

Heidegger is not saying that the world becomes an indecipherable blob in anxiety. Rather, it is just that the world has become normatively inert; it has ceased showing up as a place where my usual activities make sense and are solicited from me. In other words, none of Dasein's typical engagements currently matter. This suspension of everyday AFFORDANCE and significance enables an insight into the very ontological structure of the world: "being-anxious discloses, primordially and directly, the world as world" (SZ 187).

In anxiety the very structure of the world (its "worldhood") is thrust into the foreground, whereas normally it is in the background, receding in such a way as to enable our everyday dealings. The emergence of the structure of the world comes along with two other interrelated shifts in my Dasein's relation to and understanding of itself. This twofold shift is what Heidegger means to capture with the term "individualization." The first shift has to do with the way Dasein relates to its own projects and commitments. The second, related, shift has to do with Dasein's relation to the intelligibility of the everyday world.

Normally my relation to and understanding of myself is structured and mediated by the everyday familiarity of what one does. But in anxiety that familiarity has collapsed, gone inert. So, no matter how self-evident, natural, or taken-for-granted my sense of myself had hitherto seemed to me, being individualized in anxiety reveals that my identity is not given to me like some natural fact. From within the disorientation of anxiety, I am forced to appreciate that my identity as an individual depends upon my own active role in sustaining the commitments and projects that define my identity and anchor my orientation in the world. In other words, whereas usually I am relieved of the burden of having to take responsibility (*Verantwortlichkeit*) for how I conduct myself

because I take over what one does (see SZ 127), when anxiety individualizes me "*as being-possible*," I grasp that, whether or not I take it up, *I* myself play an active and foundational role in sustaining the commitments (the FOR-THE-SAKES-OF-WHICH) that guide me in my everyday activity and constitute my identity. This is why Heidegger connects anxiety and individualization with the possibility of AUTHENTICITY: "anxiety makes manifest in Dasein its *being towards* its ownmost ability-to-be – that is, its *being-free for* the FREEDOM of choosing itself and taking hold of itself.... Anxiety brings Dasein face to face with its *being-free for (propensio in* ...) the authenticity of its being, and for this authenticity as a possibility which it always is" (SZ 188). This anxious individualization is not only an ontological insight into the role that an individual plays in sustaining the commitments constitutive of her identity, it also affords what Heidegger calls an "existentiell" insight, putting a person into position to "take hold" of herself and to face up to the fact that: "only the particular Dasein decides its existence, whether it does so by taking hold [*Ergreifen*] or neglecting" (SZ 12).

To see the other side of this shift involved in individualization is to describe it not from the perspective of Dasein's responsibility for "taking hold" of its own existence, but instead from the perspective of the intelligibility of the everyday world itself, the way Dasein's own identity and the worldhood of the world are intertwined.

In anxiety, "the world in its worldhood is all that still obtrudes itself" (SZ 187). Anxiety makes explicit that the structure of worldhood (and its capability to provide a familiar zone for my everyday activities) only *works* (so to speak) to the extent that there are things that matter to me, things "for the sake of which" I live my life. That is, in anxiety I get explicitly struck by the fact that the "functional relations" constitutive of the worldhood of the world "are ontologically grounded in a for-the-sake-of-which" (GA24:418).

Even though the structure of the everyday world exceeds any particular Dasein and enables its own being-in-the-world, anxiety reveals that the very worldhood of the world is nevertheless bound up with the fact that the individual Dasein's own being is an issue for it. To be individualized, then, is to grasp in a first-person manner the fact that the relational whole constitutive of the world "leads to Dasein's very being as the sole authentic 'for-the-sake-of-which'" (SZ 84; see also SZ 359). Thus, Heidegger writes that, in anxiety, "Dasein has been individualized, but individualized *as being-in-the-world*" (SZ 188, my italics).

In sum, to be individualized is to be gripped by a multifaceted and anxiety-inducing insight: an ontological insight into the role that individuals play in sustaining the commitments constitutive of their own identities (identities which in turn play a pivotal role in maintaining everyday intelligibility), *and* an existentiell insight into the ungrounded role *I* play in answering for and sustaining my identity.

<div align="right">*B. Scot Rousse*</div>

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 187–89, 191, 263–66, 277, 280, 307, 310, 322, 339, 343; GA20:401–03

FURTHER READING

Crowell 2013, Haugeland 2013, Rousse 2016a, Rousse 2016b, Wrathall 2015b, Wrathall 2017a, Wrathall 2017c

INDWELLING (*INSTÄNDIGKEIT*). SEE STEADFASTNESS.

INFER (*ERSCHLIESSEN*). SEE DISCLOSEDNESS.

INHABIT (*WOHNEN*). SEE DWELLING.

INITIALLY AND FOR THE MOST PART (*ZUNÄCHST UND ZUMEIST*). SEE PROXIMALLY AND FOR THE MOST PART.

INNERNESS (*INNIGKEIT*). SEE INTIMACY.

INSIGHT (*ERKENNTNIS*). SEE COGNITION.

INSISTENCE (*INSTÄNDIGKEIT*). SEE STEADFASTNESS.

INSTANT (*AUGENBLICK*). SEE MOMENT.

INTELLECT, INTELLECTUAL UNDERSTANDING (*VERSTAND*). SEE UNDERSTANDING.

INTELLECT (*GEIST*). SEE SPIRIT.

114.
INTENTIONALITY (*INTENTIONALITÄT*)

"Intentionality" is a property, typically attributed to mental states, whereby those states are directed toward or about something. As Brentano famously put it:

> in presentation, something is presented, in judgment something is affirmed or denied, in love loved, in hate hated, in desire desired, and so on. (Brentano 1973, 88)

Heidegger himself introduces the term in deliberately similar fashion:

> *Intentio* literally means *directing-itself-toward*. Every lived experience, every psychic comportment, directs itself toward something. Representing is a representing of something, recalling is a recalling of something, judging is a judging about something, presuming, excepting, loving, hating – of something. (GA20:37; see similarly GA24:80–81)

This technical term is central to both the phenomenological tradition and much analytic philosophy of mind and language; its modern history can be traced to Brentano, who revives the term from scholastic thought. However, the very centrality of the concept makes it hard to give a neutral characterization of it.

Heidegger's attitude toward intentionality is complex. On the one hand, he is often willing to frame his own concerns regarding MEANING and DASEIN in terms of intentionality. For example, he states that "intentionality belongs to the existence of Dasein" (GA24:224), that "phenomenology is the analytic description of intentionality in its a priori" (GA20:108). On the other hand, he is clear that existing accounts of "intentionality" are radically inadequate (GA24:30). He often makes this point by employing the term "TRANSCENDENCE" instead:

> Transcendence, BEING-IN-THE-WORLD, is never to be equated and identified with intentionality. (GA26:215)

To deliver an overview of Heidegger's position, I will now highlight some of the main debates surrounding the notion of intentionality and indicate his stance on them.

First, how many forms of intentionality or "aboutness" are there, and what are the explanatory relations between them? For example, it is often argued that the way in which perceptions reveal the world and the way in which thought or language does so are fundamentally different. As Heck neatly puts it:

> Consider your current perceptual state – and now imagine what a complete description of the way the world appears to you at this moment might be like. Surely a thousand words would hardly begin to do the job. (Heck 2000, 489)

Similar views are common within the phenomenological tradition, most obviously in Merleau-Ponty. In Heidegger's case, they are typically articulated in terms of a contrast between the "as" and other modes of combination:

> The proposition "*a* is *b*" would not be possible with respect to what it means, and the way in which it means what it does, if it could not emerge from an underlying experience of "*a* as *b*." (GA29/30:436)

One important question, however, will be how much of his vision of this "underlying experience" relies on an appeal to PERCEPTION per se, and how much, for example, on claims about action, or know-how, or some other feature.

Second, to what degree should intentionality be cashed by appeal to "representations"? There are, in fact, several debates in play here, a function of a basic ambiguity in "REPRESENTATION." One question is whether the objects of my intentional states are really something like mental images: both Heidegger and Husserl are resolutely opposed to this type of Lockean indirect realism (GA20:48–49; GA24:98). Another is whether intentionality should be explained in terms of abstract entities, such as Fregean senses or Husserlian noema as these are construed by the West Coast reading; again Heidegger is hostile to such views, partly because of the difficulty of integrating such a "third realm" with the actual temporal act of judging (SZ 216). Yet another question is to what degree prima facie intentional states, such as perception, should be seen as capable of accuracy or inaccuracy? Philosophers such as Travis and Brewer, for example, reject talk of "representational content" with respect to perception on the grounds that perception cannot be true or false (Brewer 2006). Heidegger's own view here is ambiguous, partly because of his complex attitude to truth. There are passages where he appears to at least flirt with a basic mode of givenness that could not be assessed as more or less accurate (for example, SZ 33; similarly GA21:180–81); on balance, however, his emphasis on the "as" schema, with its natural implication of either understanding something appropriately or not, suppresses this trend (GA9:377/286).

Third, is intentionality metaphysically dependent on the existence of the relevant objects? For example, is it the case that at least some intentional states imply the existence of the corresponding entity? Again, Heidegger's position in this regard is at times opaque. As Zahavi notes, there are passages in which Heidegger appears to defend an internalist view, for example, GA20:40 and GA24:83–85 (Zahavi 2004, 51–52). Yet some form of externalism, on which world and mind were inseparable, would obviously mesh well with his conception of Dasein as "always already alongside entities" (SZ 62), and with the view that Cartesian skepticism is fundamentally incoherent.

These three debates can be neatly framed in terms of Heidegger's preferred "*a* as *b*" schema by asking what exactly the *a* and *b* variables refer to (GA29/30:436). In providing a full treatment of these issues, one would also need to discuss whether Dasein's intentionality is properly located at the level of mental states, or whether it is rather embodied in a sense similar to Merleau-Ponty's thought. Finally, it is worth highlighting those aspects of the intentionality debate which are central to other traditions and yet in which Heidegger, often for deep-seated reasons, shows little or no interest: the most obvious are the relation between intentionality and sensations such as pain, the ability to intend non-existent or fictional entities, and the question of whether intentionality might be reduced to some naturalistically tractable property.

Sacha Golob

INTERMEDIATE (*ZWISCHEN*). SEE BETWEEN.

115.

INTERPRETATION (*AUSLEGUNG*)

AN INTERPRETATION IS an engagement with something in which an agent is committed to working out, developing, and refining one of the possible ways of making sense of it. Interpretation involves addressing something *as* something, or putting it to use *as* something. In an interpretive commitment to a possibility, an agent develops a prior UNDERSTANDING by applying it in a specific situation. For Heidegger, to understand something is to possess a complex of practical, cognitive, or linguistic skills for seeing the multiple possibilities that it affords – as Heidegger puts it, "an entity which is understood" is "an entity that has been projected upon its possibility (SZ 194). Interpretation, for Heidegger, is "working out" the "possibilities projected in the understanding" (SZ 148) by "enacting" or making actual a possible way of construing the thing in question. Interpretation is "the mode of enactment of understanding … specifically as the cultivation, appropriation, and preservation of what is discovered in understanding" (GA20:366). Stephan Käufer has argued, with considerable merit, that it would be best to translate Heidegger's German term for interpretation – *Auslegung* – as "construal," capturing nicely the idea that each human action inevitably contributes to a particular way of construing the intelligibility of ourselves and the world (see Käufer 2015, 101, 104).

When we interpret a text, for instance, we commit ourselves to one possible reading of its meaning. In developing the interpretation, we explain various passages of the text in the light of that possible construal. Likewise when we interpret an idea or a concept, we elucidate its significance according to one particular way of making sense of it while dismissing other possible ways of construing it. Throughout his published works, Heidegger uses "interpretation" in this ordinary way – that is, as referring to the explicit explaining, bringing out, expounding, and elucidating of meaning. He writes, inter alia, of the interpretation of BEING, of entities, of BEYNG, of BEINGNESS, of NATURE, of POETRY and works of ART, of the doctrine of the will to power or the eternal recurrence, of Greek philosophy, of Kant, of Nietzsche, of the principle of contradiction, of humans as animal rationale or as Da-sein (see GA66:146), of TRUTH as correspondence or correctness or ALÊTHEIA, of SPACE and TIME, of thought, of NIHILISM, and of the HISTORY OF BEING.

In the 1920s, and especially in *Being and Time*, Heidegger also uses "interpretation" in a specific, technical sense as a name for an EXISTENTIAL, a constitutive feature of human existence. In his 1923 lecture course on *Ontology – The Hermeneutics of Facticity*, for instance, Heidegger insisted that "interpretation is itself a possible and distinctive 'how' of the character of the being of FACTICITY. Interpretation is a being of the being of factical life itself" (GA63:15). And in *Being and Time*, Heidegger noted that interpretation (along with the understanding) "makes up the existential constitution of the being of the 'THERE'" (SZ 151). Throughout this period, a core insight of Heidegger's account of human existence, or DASEIN, is the recognition that HUMAN BEINGS are essentially interpretive beings. We are

always involved in construing, developing, demonstrating, and articulating the meaning things have (or in contesting the construals and articulations of others).

Because it involves construing things in a particular way, "interpreting means an uncovering which addresses something *as* something" (GA20:373). Each interpretation works by "bringing to prominence" one way of making sense of things, one "'as-what' the encountered thing can be taken.... The primary form of all interpretation is the addressing of something in terms of its 'as what,' considering something as something" (GA20:359–60). "The 'as,'" Heidegger explains, "makes up the structure of the expressness of what is understood; it constitutes the interpretation" (SZ 149; see As-structure). "Seeing as," for Heidegger, does not imply that we first encounter something as devoid of a use or significance, and then attach to it a predicate. Something has an *as* when it simply and immediately invites us to use it in a particular way. In our everyday dealings, Heidegger insists that, for instance, a desk directly shows up as affording writing (see GA21, §12).

Whereas the understanding is a structural feature of our being-in-the-world, interpretation is an *activity* that develops and enriches the understanding. As I pursue some definite set of possibilities that the world affords me – as I let myself be solicited by some possibility – that possibility will, for its part, demand of me that I develop myself to respond appropriately to it. The possibilities "exert a counter thrust [*Rückschlag*]" (SZ 148) – they rebound or push back at us, changing us and forcing us to adapt to them. As we commit to a definite possibility, then, we develop and refine and execute and perfect our skills for seeing what possibilities are afforded to us. Heidegger identifies several key moments to this process of interpreting or "laying out" (the literal meaning of the German *Aus-legung*) a possibility:

> The projecting of the understanding has its own possibility – that of developing itself. This development [*Ausbildung*] of the understanding we call "interpretation" [*Auslegung*]. In it the understanding appropriates understandingly that which is understood by it. In interpretation, understanding does not become something different. It becomes itself. Such interpretation is grounded existentially in understanding; the latter does not arise from the former. Nor is interpretation the acquiring of information about what is understood; it is rather the working-out [*Ausarbeitung*] of possibilities projected in understanding. (SZ 148)

One moment of existential interpretation is the "working out" of the possibilities projected in the understanding. "Working out" (*Ausarbeitung*) is executing, accomplishing, bringing about what our understanding offers to us as a possibility. Another moment of the interpretation is the *Ausbildung*, the development or cultivation or refinement of the understanding. As we encounter the concrete particularities of a situation opened up in a projection, we acquire a more precise, more closely tailored understanding of what possibilities the world affords us. In yet another moment, the interpretive act lifts into salience some particular set of relationships within which entities and actions lie at any given moment. In interpretation, as Heidegger puts it, things "come *expressly* [*ausdrücklich*] into the sight which understands" (SZ 149). Thus

> interpretation as such does not actually disclose, for that is what understanding or Dasein itself takes care of. Interpretation always only takes care of bringing out what is disclosed as a development of the possibilities inherent in an understanding. (GA20:359)

It is no accident that Heidegger's account of interpretation makes use of so many words built around a common prefix: the *aus-* or "out-." Interpretation "lays out" the world in a particular way. As it does so, it "works out" or develops possibilities in concreteness. It "develops out" or refines our ability to project. And it "presses out" or makes salient particular relationships. How are we to understand in general the contrast between the "in"-ness of the understanding and the "out"-ness of interpretation? It is the distinction between what is merely contemplated versus what is executed (in English, we call this "carrying out"). It is the distinction between what is perceived in general and imprecisely versus what is discerned with sufficient detail and richness (in English, we call this "making out" – discerning in detail). Interpretation, we could say, is "exacting," invoking here the etymology to inform our sense. The English adjective "exact" comes from the past participle of the Latin verb *ex-agere* – literally to act out, to drive out, force out. What is "exact" in the traditional sense is what has been driven or pursued until it has achieved perfection or completion. A person or an action that is exact is one that is highly skilled or accomplished. It is within such a context of semantic values that one is to hear Heidegger's use of the word *Auslegung*.

Thus, in interpretation, the world gets "laid out" in a particular, more precise, more detailed way than was grasped prior to the interpretation. Only with a commitment to a particular possibility, Heidegger notes, do things "genuinely come into the environment as present" (GA20:359). Only then is something "first genuinely understood" because that is "when one has come into the involvement which one has with the environmental thing" (GA20:359).

Interpretation is a pervasive feature of human existence because the world is always already interpreted in a certain way – a given community has already understood itself and arranged its environment so as to foster one possible way of living at the expense of others. "In no case," Heidegger notes, "is a Dasein untouched and unseduced by this [the everyday way] in which things have been interpreted" (SZ 169). To be caught up in conventions, norms, and publicly shared modes of behavior is one way to inhabit a particular interpretation. Our immediate, unthinking reaction to the world focuses on particular possibilities "in accordance with the way things have been interpreted by the 'ANYONE.' This interpretation has already restricted the possible options of choice to what lies within the range of the familiar, the attainable, the respectable – that which is fitting and proper" (SZ 129). The anyone (*das Man*) "sketches out in advance the most immediate interpretation of the world and being in the world. Dasein is for the sake of the anyone-self in an everyday manner, and the anyone-self articulates the referential context of significance" (SZ 129). We always encounter the world, in other words, as soliciting us to pursue particular possibilities. When responding to these solicitations and doing what "one" does in our culture, we "maintain" ourselves "in an average interpretedness" (SZ 406).

As noted above, familiar, everyday acts of interpretation – the explanation of a text, the elucidation of a concept – proceed by offering an *explicit* account of the sense or significance of some topic. Many scholars assume that existential interpretation must also involve the making explicit of what is projected in the understanding. For instance, Dreyfus reads interpretation as the understanding "becom[ing] explicit in the practical deliberation necessitated when a skill fails to suffice, and what thus becomes thematic can be expressed in speech acts" (Dreyfus 1991, 195). Blattner argues that the understanding consists of "our engaged abilities, our skills and capacities" (Blattner 2006, 94), while interpretation is "an act of understanding in which we make what we understand explicit" (*ibid.*, 92). "Explicit" means, for Blattner, "suffused with conceptuality" (*ibid.*, 96), meaning linguistically expressible: "the distinction between

understanding and interpretation in *Being and Time*," Blattner explains, is "the line between those forms of intelligence that can be captured in propositions and those that cannot" (Blattner 2007, 14). These commentators are certainly right that interpretation *can* take such explicit forms. But it need not, and Heidegger himself distinguishes between thematic interpretation and circumspective interpretation – between explicit and absorbed forms of interpretation (see SZ 150). He notes, for instance, that

> the circumspectively-interpretive coping with what is environmentally available, which "sees" this as a table, a door, a carriage, a bridge, does not necessarily need to lay apart in a determining assertion. All prepredicative simple seeing of the available is in itself already understanding-interpreting. (SZ 149)

Thus, coping can be interpretive, without requiring any act of explicitation. The mistaken belief that all interpretation is explicit perhaps stems from overlooking a distinction Heidegger employs between "express" (*ausdrücklich*) and "explicit" (*explizit*) interpretations. EXPRESSNESS is roughly equivalent to *salience*. Interpretive acts always involve making salient some particular meaning or relationship between things (while allowing others to withdraw into the background). Something can be expressed or made salient in many different ways – through a linguistic act, through a thought, through deliberate action, but also through circumspective action in which we are solicited by and act upon a particular significance. Heidegger refers to thematic forms of expressness as "explicit" (*explizit*), thereby distinguishing them from more circumspective forms of expressness.

Mark A. Wrathall

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 148ff.; GA18:90; GA19:632–33; GA20:359–60, 370–73, 377, 414; GA55:63; GA63:15; GA70:164–65

FURTHER READING

Blattner 2006, 84–97, Blattner 2007, Carman 2003, 18–22, Dreyfus 1991, 184–214, Wrathall 2013b

116.
INTIMACY (*INNIGKEIT*)

NTIMACY IS A state of intense belongingness which arises from a meaningful connection or mutual dependence of at least two entities. It includes an affective dimension but cannot be reduced to emotional experience. Moreover, Heidegger employs "intimacy" – as well as the adjective "intimate" (*innig*) – often to emphasize the relatedness of opposed principles or forces. *Innigkeit* may be translated best into English as "intimacy," in the sense of a particular closeness. But depending on the context, it also can be translated as "wholeheartedness" or "inwardness."

Heidegger discovers intimacy as a philosophical topic while studying Hölderlin's poetry. The word does not appear in the early lecture courses or in *Being and Time*. In Heidegger's interpretation, intimacy is crucial for understanding the philosophical importance of Hölderlin. Thus, Heidegger refers to intimacy as the "foundational word" or "basic metaphysical concept" of Hölderlin's poetry (GA39:129, 249). Since poetic language does not follow the same rules as scientific prose, Heidegger refrains from giving a comprehensive definition of the word: "its content cannot, of course, be captured in some scholarly definition" (GA39:117). This, however, does not prevent him from interpreting Hölderlin's use of the word and subsequently adopting the word in his own writing (including his attempt to write poetry).

Hölderlin writes in a side note related to his unfinished drama *The Death of Empedocles:* "Everything is intimate" (*Alles ist innig*). The note, cited by Heidegger several times (GA4:73/95, 196/224; GA75:363), is concerned with the idea of the immediacy of intellectual intuition (*intellektuelle Anschauung*) and the question whether it can be achieved through poetry. That question has an existential dimension for Hölderlin, which, interestingly, is lost in Heidegger's interpretation of the sentence. Heidegger rather takes the adage as an insight into the ontological structure of the WORLD: The sentence "means that one is appropriated to the other, but in such a way that thereby it itself remains in what is proper to it, or even first attains to it: gods and mortals, earth and heaven. Intimacy does not mean the coalescence and obliteration of distinctions. Intimacy names the belonging together of what is foreign, the ruling of the strange, the claim of awe" (GA4:196/224–25). Thus, intimacy is an essential aspect of the FOURFOLD (*Geviert*): As dimensions of the fourfold gods and mortals, EARTH and heaven are intimately connected. The definition of one dimension of the fourfold necessitates an understanding of the other dimensions. The very fact that the fourfold is constituted by relational structures is what is expressed by saying that it is intimate.

In Heidegger's understanding, poetry discloses the intimacy of the fourfold (GA4:163/188; GA13:178). Therefore, poetry becomes a decisive theme for the later Heidegger. The relation between poetry and philosophy is explicitly characterized by "intimacy" (GA71:330/286). This does not call into question the very distinction of poetry and philosophy but rather expresses the claim that poetry and philosophy are essentially connected insofar as both are concerned with the same subject-matter. Poetry, however, is not only addressing intimacy, but is itself an "intimate" way of language. Thus the complex basic MOODS essential to the work of the poet are related "intimately" to each other (GA4:122/144; GA52:153). This holds true for similar

moods, and even more so for opposed moods – such as joy and mourning (GA39:135). In order to stress the importance of intimacy as a uniting "power" that is essential for poetry, Heidegger distinguishes it from "romantic sentimentality" (*romantische Sentimentalität*) and "cherished fondness of heart" (*besonders liebliche Herzlichkeit*, GA39:249). Yet, intimacy can also be found in personal relationships: "Indeed, Hölderlin unfolds the greatest intimacy precisely where he speaks to her (his mother) from the immense distance that is caused by his terrible calling" (GA39:35). It is the estrangement from his mother that allows the poet to write to her with a special affection. Intimacy in this case evolves from the inner tension between distance and closeness.

Intimacy is generally related in Heidegger to the Heraclitean idea of the unity of opposites. It is frequently used as synonymous for the "hidden harmony" that governs the struggle of opposed forces or principles (GA39:124). In "The Origin of the Work of Art" and *Contributions to Philosophy* (GA65), Heidegger attributes intimacy to the "strife" of world and earth: "the more intransigently the strife outdoes itself on its own part, the more uncompromisingly do the opponents admit themselves into the intimacy of their simple belongings to one another" (GA5:35/27). Strife and intimacy are thus two sides of the same intensified relation. This is why intimacy and "enmity" are said to be the same (GA39:282, 273). The intimacy of world and earth corresponds to the basic phenomenological opposition of concealment and unconcealment. Since Heidegger includes this opposition in his definition of TRUTH, intimacy also becomes an aspect of the happening of truth (GA55:133; GA65:345). Intimacy further appears in the relation of world and THING (GA12:30/PLT 207) and is part of "BEYNG" and "ADAPTATION" (*Ereignis*) (GA65:356). More specifically, it is associated with the inceptual quality of the "other INCEPTION": "intimacy is the word for the inceptualness of the inception [*Anfänglichkeit des Anfangs*]" (GA70:47). In this sense, intimacy marks the precious moment when a phenomenon begins to show itself.

Nikola Mirkovic

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Intimacy and poetry GA4:73/95, 122/144, 196/224; GA12:22ff./PLT 199ff.; GA12:207, 219/OWL 139, 150; GA13:178; GA39:35, 117, 129, 249; GA52:153; GA71:330/286; GA75:363
Intimacy in Heidegger's poems GA81:83, 94, 132, 133, 149, 175, 179
Intimacy and the fourfold GA4:163/188, 196/224–25; GA13:178
Intimacy and strife GA5:35–36/27–28, 51/38; GA39:124, 273, 282; GA65:34/25; GA40:122/121; GA76:98; GA94:274
Intimacy and adaptation GA54:199/134; GA55:133; GA65:264, 345, 356; GA66:414; GA70:22, 24, 39, 47, 66, 91, 95, 159; GA71:191/163, 215/184, 221/190, 290/251, 302/262; GA75:120–25, 363; GA85:119

INTIMATION (*WINK*). SEE HINT.

INTONATION (*ANSTIMMUNG*). SEE MOOD.

INTRAWORLDLY (*INNERWELTLICH*). SEE WORLD.

117.

INTUITION (*ANSCHAUUNG*)

INTUITION IN GENERAL is the seeing or apprehending of something that shows itself. Heidegger, in turn, delineates several species of intuition: sensory intuition, which is the apprehension of something sensory; categorial intuition, which is the apprehension of something non-sensory; and hermeneutical intuition, which is the intuition a phenomenologist should use to apprehend and interpret phenomena.

Heidegger's analysis of intuition takes its cue from what he identifies as a dominant tradition in philosophy that privileges intuition as opposed to the intellect as the most original form of access to and knowledge we have of entities. As he characterizes this tradition in *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, from antiquity to Kant and Hegel, intuition is the ideal of knowledge, the ideal of the apprehending of entities in general, and the concept of TRUTH in knowledge is oriented to intuition (GA24:157–58/118; see also SZ 57, 96).

He takes this commitment to the primacy of intuition to be evident, for example, in the fact that the Greeks "define the mode of access to the OCCURRENT [*Vorhandenen*] primarily as an intuitive finding present [*das anschauende Vorfinden*]" and in Kant's claim that, "intuition is that … upon which all thought as a means is directed" (GA24:154/109; GA3:21).[1]

However, Heidegger claims that Husserl is to be credited with refining the notion of intuition in important ways by introducing a distinction between sensory and categorial intuition. As Heidegger presents Husserl's view in *History of the Concept of Time*, unlike most other thinkers in the tradition, Husserl recognizes that intuition is not an exclusively sensory act, but rather that intuition should be defined in a broad sense to encompass any act in which we apprehend an object, whether sensory or non-sensory. Thus, Husserl distinguishes between two different kinds of intuition:

> sensory intuition in which we apprehend sensory objects that are "bodily given" to us, e.g., a yellow chair, and categorial intuition in which we apprehend non-sensory or ideal objects, e.g., "'allness,' 'number,' 'subject,' 'predicate,' 'state of affairs,' 'something.'" (GA20:64, 80)

Although categorial intuitions are directed toward non-sensory objects, Heidegger points out that they are nevertheless "founded" in sensory intuitions, e.g., they can make a state of affairs implicit in the sensory intuition explicit or they can use the sensory intuition as a basis upon which we can see something else categorial, like an idea or species (GA20:81, 84). Furthermore, he emphasizes that categorial intuition is not an abstract act we occasionally engage in; rather, it "is invested in the most everyday of perceptions and in every experience," e.g., when we perceive something "as" something (GA20:64, 91).

---

[1] See GA3 and GA24 for Heidegger's extended interpretation of Kant's theory of intuition.

Heidegger's assessment of these historical approaches to intuition is twofold. On the one hand, in *Being and Time* he is critical of the idea that intuition (or as it is sometimes translated "beholding") represents our most primary and original way of accessing entities:

> "Intuition" and "thinking" are both derivatives of understanding, and already rather remote ones. Even the phenomenological "intuitions of essence" is grounded in existential understanding. (SZ 147)

For Heidegger, existential UNDERSTANDING is the sort of "sight" (*Sicht*) that Dasein has which "lets entities which are accessible be encountered unconcealedly by themselves" and it is what grounds our original way of accessing entities, e.g., through the CIRCUMSPECTION (*Umsicht*) that gives us access to available entities, solicitude (*Rücksicht*) that gives us access to other DASEIN, and the sight that gives us access to being as such (SZ 147, 146). By contrast, he claims that insofar as intuition involves merely "looking at something ..., setting our sights towards what is occurrent," it is a derivative way of accessing entities (SZ 88).

On the other hand, Heidegger is more sympathetic to the idea that intuition is the foundation of the phenomenological method. To begin, he suggests that Husserl's discovery of categorial intuition is significant for three reasons. First, it reveals that there are acts in which we grasp ideal objects, which are not "constructs of ... the SUBJECT" (GA20:97). Second, it "paves the way for a genuine form of research," viz., phenomenological research in which we elucidate the "structures" of these ideal ("apriori") objects (GA20:98). Third, insofar as it encourages us to "broaden the idea of objectivity," it helps us recognize that PHENOMENOLOGY is a form of ONTOLOGY (GA20:98). For Heidegger, then, Husserl's theory of categorial intuition serves as an important precursor for his own conception of phenomenology as a form of research in which we investigate ontological structures that show themselves to us.

However, Heidegger rejects Husserl's claim that phenomenology involves categorial intuition defined as the "analytic description of intentionality in its apriori" (GA20:108). On Heidegger's view, phenomenological research should not be concerned primarily with INTENTIONALITY, but rather with the question of the SENSE of being. For this reason, he argues that the sort of description phenomenology involves should be hermeneutical, i.e., it should involve "interpretation ... through which the authentic sense of being, and also those basic structures of being which Dasein possess, are made known to Dasein's understanding of being" (SZ 37; see also GA20:190; HERMENEUTICS). Thus, for Heidegger, the sort of seeing that the phenomenological method rests upon is hermeneutical in nature. Though he does not use the phrase in *Being and Time*, this sort of seeing is what he calls "hermeneutical intuition" in his early lectures:

> The empowering experience of LIVED EXPERIENCE that takes itself along is the understanding [*verstehende*], the hermeneutical intuition, the originary phenomenological back-and-forth formation of concepts from which all theoretical objectification, indeed all transcendental positing falls out. (GA56/57:117)

Hermeneutical intuition is, thus, something that apprehends experience in meaningful ways prior to theoretical objectification. On Heidegger's view, this can be of value to phenomenology

insofar as it allows one both to see phenomena as they show themselves and to interpret those phenomena according to what they mean.

Samantha Matherne

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA5:305/228; GA20:63–103, 107, 109, 130; GA24:149/106, 154–55/109–11, 158/112, 165–67/117–18, 184–85/131–33, 354/250; GA56/55: 117

118.
INVENTORY (*GE-STELL*)

T HE "INVENTORY" IS the collection and reconfiguration of all entities, through which they are transformed into resources or STANDING RESERVE, and stored or placed in such a manner that they are on call and available to be used, combined, and reconfigured in whatever way we see fit. The German term *Gestell*, translated here as "inventory," means in colloquial use a "shelf" or "rack." For Heidegger, the term is meant to capture what is essential about TECHNOLOGY – namely the way that the technological understanding of being discloses everything as orderable into an inventory or reservoir of options, and strives to transform everything into a stock of goods:

> Let us at long last stop conceiving technology as something purely technical, that is, in terms of the human being and its machines. Let us listen to the demand placed in our age not only upon human beings, but also upon all entities, nature and history, with regard to their being. What claim do we have in mind? Our whole human existence everywhere sees itself challenged – now playfully and now urgently, now breathlessly and now ponderously – to devote itself to the planning and calculating (and navigating) of everything. . . . Human beings are challenged, that is, *ordered* to secure all entities that matter to them as the stock for their planning and calculating. . . . "The inventory" [*das Ge-Stell*] is the name for the collection [effected by] this challenge which delivers the human being and being to each other in such a way that they alternately set each other in place. (GA11:43/ID 34–35)

The inventory is thus an artificial setting-everything-into-place that allows endless forms of combination and reconfiguration. For a more detailed discussion, and alternative translation, of Heidegger's notion of *das Ge-Stell*, see the entry on SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT(ION)ING.

<div align="right">

Mark A. Wrathall

</div>

FURTHER READING

Wrathall 2018

INVOLVEMENT (*BEWANDTNIS*). SEE AFFORDANCE.

ISSUE (*SACHE*). SEE MATTER, THE.

J

JOINT (*FUGE*). **SEE FITTING.**

119.

JOINTEDNESS (*GLIEDERUNG*)

J OINTEDNESS IS A characterization of the kind of structure produced in the process of articulating DASEIN's disclosure of the WORLD. A jointed structure is one that has constituent parts with an identity and function that can be understood only in relation to a systematic or more original whole to which they belong.

Jointedness (*Gliederung*) is one of several terms Heidegger uses in *Being and Time* to describe features of the transformation of indeterminate background meaning or SENSE (*Sinn*) into distinct or delimited MEANINGS (*Bedeutungen*) capable of being marked by an expression. The term "jointedness" and cognates are closely connected with the notion of "ARTICULATION" (*Artikulation*) in both standard German and Heidegger's own more technical use. However, in one key passage defining DISCOURSE (*Rede*) Heidegger uses these two terms to make a significant distinction: "intelligibility is also always-already jointed [*gegliedert*] before appropriating interpretation. Discourse is the articulation [*Artikulation*] of intelligibility" (SZ 161). Although he elsewhere also links articulation with INTERPRETATION (see ARTICULATION), this passage states that Dasein's disclosure has an articulate structure, or jointedness, prior to the process of articulation in "appropriating interpretation."

While this distinction between articulate structure and articulation processes is important, Heidegger often uses the two terms employed here interchangeably and apparently synonymously. For example, SZ 161 characterizes discourse not only as the "articulation" but also as the "jointing" (*das Gliedern*) of intelligibility on the same page. Similarly, in the mode of calling, discourse "joints" intelligibility (SZ 271). Discourse is also described as both "articulat[ing] in terms of meanings" (*bedeutungsmäßig artikuliert*, SZ 161) and "jointedness in terms of meanings" (*bedeutungsmäßige Gliederung*, SZ 162). Heidegger further characterizes the world's indeterminate background sense (*Sinn*) as allowing both articulation (*artikulierbar*, SZ 151) and jointing (*gliederbar*, SZ 153), talks of "predicating articulation" as having "jointed parts" (*Glieder*, SZ 155), and at one point simply glosses "articulated" as "jointed" (GA21:55). Heidegger's use of these two terms cannot therefore be sharply distinguished.

There are, however, some subtle differences in Heidegger's use that reflect a slight difference in emphasis. In talking of jointedness or jointed parts Heidegger tends to be emphasizing a certain kind of structural relations and hinting at the correct method for studying them. One indication of this emphasis is the fact – hinted at by Macquarrie and Robinson (see BT 195n., translators' note at SZ 154) – that Heidegger talks of jointed parts when referring specifically to the parts or constituents of some relation (*Beziehungsglieder*, SZ 216, 224), such as the two poles of the Cartesian subject–object opposition (*Gegensatzglieder*, SZ 89, 208). This is no doubt partly because in German, while the verbs "to articulate" (*artikulieren*) and "to joint" (*gliedern*) are largely synonymous in normal use, there is no established noun corresponding to the former. Hence, to refer to the constituent parts of the structures he is describing Heidegger

uses the established German term *Glied* (rather than somewhat clumsily falling back on the Latin *artus*, meaning limb or joint, on which *artikulieren* is based).

More precisely, however, Heidegger's concern is with a specific kind of structure made up of interconnected parts that essentially belong to a more original system whole, such that a system with a jointed structure (*Gliederung*) is made up of joints or jointed parts (*Glieder*). As these terms suggest – the German *Glied* means a limb or body part – jointed parts are like the parts of a skeleton or body, each of which has its place and function in that larger system. The intended contrast is with essentially unconnected or independent parts, such as grains of sand or atoms, the identity of which does not depend on their relation to an overarching system. Heidegger's use of this terminology has a precedent in Kant's contrast between a whole that is systematically "jointed" (*gegliedert*, Kant's translation of the Latin *articulatio*) and a whole that is formed by parts being "heaped" together (*gehäuft*, Kant 1998, B 861). Indeed, according to Heidegger, this kind of structure is already found in the Kantian sensory manifold in which objects are "given" prior to its "ordering" through thought (GA21:299–300).

Heidegger often talks of jointedness in his own work to emphasize this kind of systematic or organic relation between a whole and its parts. It is particularly accentuated in his various characterizations of CARE (*Sorge*) as "structurally jointed" (*struktural gegliedert*, SZ 196, 200), a "jointed structural totality" (*gegliederte Strukturganzheit*, SZ 234), and a "jointed structure" (*gegliederte Struktur*) or a "structural manifold" that forms a "unified totality" (SZ 327). As Heidegger explains, the "totality of Dasein's constitution itself is hence not simple in its unity, but exhibits [*zeigt*] a structural jointedness that is expressed in the existential concept of care" (SZ 200; see also 317, 324). But he also discerns this kind of structure in other contexts. For example, BEING-IN-THE-WORLD is characterized as a "jointed structure" with a "structural unity that cannot be torn apart" (SZ 351), Dasein's "being-a-whole" as a "jointed structural whole" (SZ 325), and the "primordial totality of Dasein's CONSTITUTION (*Verfassung*)" as "jointed" (SZ 334). Perhaps tellingly, Heidegger also routinely uses this term to characterize the structure of his own texts (SZ 39 and *passim*).

The correct method for studying jointed structures should clearly allow their constituent parts or aspects to be recognized as simultaneously distinct and belonging to a whole, rather than suggesting they can be decomposed into independent elements. One way Heidegger sees himself doing this is by using hyphenated expressions such as "being-in-the-world" or "being-ahead-of-oneself" to signal the underlying unity of these structures (SZ 53, 196). More importantly, the notion of jointed structures clearly resonates with Heidegger's conception of phenomenology as non-reductive description that avoids breaking up or shattering the phenomena under consideration. Indeed, shortly before *Being and Time* he had described the capacity of phenomenology – specifically, Husserl's categorial intuition – to bring such structural features to our awareness as the introduction of jointedness to some previously unjointed MATTER (*ungegliederte Sache*, GA20:85). Accordingly, he went on to define the kind of descriptions or analyses offered by phenomenology as the imposition of a jointedness that highlights or brings out structural features (*heraushebende Gliederung*, GA20:107). Although the underlying thought is retained in *Being and Time* (and beyond), Heidegger there tends to prefer the label *Artikulation* to refer to the processes of articulation involved in phenomenology, and instead characterizes phenomenological description as a hermeneutic method based on

the notion of interpretation (*Auslegung*) and its link with the imposition of an appropriate as-structure (SZ 37).

The preceding considerations also hint at Heidegger's attitude to "analysis" or "dissection" (*Zergliederung*), a term he occasionally adopts in talking about the work of others, such as Kant or Dilthey, who had also used it to describe their own work. In German the prefix *zer-* conveys that something is being dissolved, damaged, or destroyed, in this case the structure of jointedness. Accordingly, for Heidegger, the word *Zergliederung* suggests that analysis – in contrast to phenomenological description – is a method that reductively seeks independent elements, and so fails to respect and capture the inherent interconnections between the structures it identifies. Heidegger's occasional use of this term might therefore plausibly be seen as intimating his own distance from, and perhaps his disapproval of, analysis as a method (see, e.g., SZ 273; GA29/30:378; GA3:42).

While the structural features linked with jointedness in *Being and Time* remain important, Heidegger later drops this terminology. In *On the Way to Language*, for example, it is applied only to common sense and unsatisfactory philosophical views of language (GA12:232, 234, 243/OWL 113–14, 115, 123–24). Instead he uses the terms *Fuge* (a joint, seam, or gap) and *fügen* (to create joints) in much the same way (see Fittingness). The inherited "saying" of language, for example, is the "jointing gathering of the in-itself manifold showing" that is inherent in "all appearing" (*Die Sage ist die alles Scheinen fügende Versammlung des in sich vielfältigen Zeigens*, GA12:246/OWL 126). As they are used to refer to the joints and fit between construction elements (e.g., tiles, masonry) the later terms have connotations that are artisanal rather than physiological, while hinting that our language is somehow our destiny (*Fügung* also means providence), and even allow Heidegger to suggest a connection with a symbol in the Greek sense of a joint, seam, or hinge (*Fuge, Naht, Gelenk*, GA29/30:445f.).

Andrew Inkpin

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 153, 161, 162; GA20:85–87, 107
Referring to parts SZ 89, 155, 208, 216, 224
Whole and part structure SZ 168, 196, 200, 234, 317, 324, 325, 327, 334, 351; GA29/30:527
As text structure SZ 4, 39, 114, 237, 270, 332, 335, 377, 406
***Zergliederung* (dissection)** SZ 178, 209, 273

FURTHER READING

Blattner 1999, 67–75, Carman 2003, 229–32, Dreyfus 1991, 208, 215–24, Wrathall 2011, 95–156, esp. 108–09, 131, Wrathall 2013a, 206–07, 214–19

JOINTURE (*FUGE*). SEE FITTINGNESS.

JUNCTION (*FUG*). SEE FITTINGNESS.

JUNCTURE (*FUGE*). SEE FITTINGNESS.

JUST THERE (*VORHANDEN*). SEE OCCURRENT.

120.
JUSTICE (*GERECHTIGKEIT/DIKÊ*)

J USTICE IS ORDINARILY understood as a juridical-moral condition of rightness or correctness or fairness – for instance, rightness in one's behavior, or in the substantive effect or application of the law, or in the administration of social institutions, or in the distribution of social goods. But Heidegger was interested in justice understood as a particular style of the unfolding of BEING – namely, an order of being in an originary sense that is not preset or that overrides all entities in advance of what appears, but that emerges in and through the dynamic fit of oppositional tension between con-junction and dis-junction occurring in the singular joint of appearance (what Anaximander thinks as "genesis," coming-to-be). This "fit" is radically temporal, fitting into the LINGERING of each being within the limits afforded by the jointure. For human beings, this means that our lingering or whiling is limited by our mortality which, in turn, structures our SOJOURN (*Aufenthalt*/ethos) upon the earth. Here is where *ethos* and *dikê* intersect for Heidegger – at the singular, one-time joint where humans dwell within the FOURFOLD as beings who let themselves belong to the fit; acceding to their limits, yet open to *Ereignis* (see ADAPTATION). This constitutes what Heidegger calls *originary ethics*: harmony with the *dikê* (*Fug*) of *phusis*, an ordering of coming to be/perishing "as the essentially appropriate enjoining [*wesensmässige Fügung*] of all entities" (GA43:204). It is precisely in this sense of the fitting together of all entities that Heidegger can claim: "the authentic knowledge of *dikê* – the enjoining laws (*Fügungsgesetzen*) of being as such – is philosophy."

Given his critique of the HISTORY OF METAPHYSICS as a "FORGETFULNESS OF BEING," Heidegger shies away from offering any definitive names for being itself. Beginning with his work of the 1930s to 1940s, Heidegger puts forward a number of terms that attempt to express various modes and possibilities of the way being unfolds and conceals its unfolding: *Ereignis*, the fourfold (*Geviert*), ALÊTHEIA, the TRUTH of being, DESTINY (*Geschick*), et al. His hope in offering this multiplicity of names for being's way of essentially unfolding is less to "overcome" (*überwinden*) metaphysics than it is to attempt a "recovery from" or "conversion" (*Verwindung*) of the monolithic drive of metaphysics to reduce all entities to what is calculable and ready for use and consumption. One of these various names for "being" that Heidegger proposes during this period is *Fug* (order, fit, jointure), which has etymological connections with *Fuge* (fittingness, conjuncture), *Gefüge* (structure), *Fügung* (joining, dispensation), and *Verfügung* (disposal, availability) (see FITTINGNESS). This whole paronomastic play on the roots of *Fug* and *fügen* will come to language as another way for Heidegger to prepare the transition to another INCEPTION OF THINKING.

In these etymologically concealed relations surrounding "fitting," Heidegger finds a way to rethink the traditional metaphysical approach to "justice" that he sees as reigning within the history of the West from Plato through Nietzsche and beyond. What comes to language here for Heidegger in the German term *Fuge* is the originary power of gathering entities together in a fit that is fitting, one that dispenses (*fügen*) order (*Fug*) fittingly (*fügend*) in such a way that human beings are faced with the task of complying with or submitting to (*sich fügen*) its dispensations (*Fügungen*).

In *Introduction to Metaphysics* (1935) Heidegger offers "fit" (*Fug*) as a translation for *dikê*, the term usually translated into German as *Gerechtigkeit* (justice). Heidegger claims that "when one translates *dikê* as 'justice' – and understands justice in a juridical-moral sense – then the word loses its fundamental metaphysical content" (GA40:169/171). The same critique holds when we think *dikê* as "norm," "law," or "right" – terms that reflect a legal or judicial understanding, but that fail to think the "overwhelming" dimension of being as what is uncanny and resistant to human control. Instead, Heidegger will think *dikê* as belonging together with two other fundamental Greek terms: *phusis* and *logos*, thought in Heraclitus' sense. As Heidegger puts it: "being, *phusis*, is, as sway, originary gatheredness: *logos*. Being is the conjoining fit [*fügender Fug*]: *dikê*." Heidegger goes on to say that this notion of being as *dikê* (*Fug*) needs to be grasped in terms of its "reciprocal relation" to *techne*, one where they are joined in the opposition between "the excessive violence of being" (*die Übergewalt des Seins*) and the human being's capacity for "violence-doing" (*die Gewalt-tätigkeit des Daseins*, GA40:171/173). In this violent CONFRONTATION or *Aus-einander-setzung* that brings into play the counter-turning relation of *dikê* and *techne*, Heidegger finds a way to express "the enjoining structure" (*das fügende Gefüge*) of being as *phusis* that comes to language in the Heraclitean *logos* of cosmic order. In fragment B 80 Heraclitus writes: "one must realize that war (*polemos*) is shared and conflict (*eris*) is justice (*dikê*) and that all things come to pass in accordance with conflict." But Heidegger will challenge the metaphysical assumptions about justice and conflict here and translate this as: "It is necessary to keep in view both setting-apart-from-each-other (*Aus-einander-setzung*) as essentially bringing-together and fittingness (*Fug*) as counter-turning" (GA40:175/177). That is, Heidegger reads Heraclitean strife (*eris*) as a bringing-together and fittingness (*dikê*) as a fit that is held together in oppositional harmony. Jointure essentially unfolds as disjointure; fittingness (*Fug*) is dispersed into unfittingness (*Un-Fug*). Fittingly, the primordial *logos* of Heraclitus falls into idle chatter and only through the violent upheaval of a philosophical revolution can language ever come to poetic-thinkerly expression.

In his lectures of the mid-1930s, Heidegger begins to focus upon what justice means, setting it into dialogue with the work of both Nietzsche and the pre-Socratics. Nietzsche will translate *dikê* as justice (*Gerechtigkeit*) and, corresponding to this Roman way of understanding, will think truth (*veritas*) as certainty and what is correct (*das Richtige*), namely as "what is right [*das Rechte*] . . . and in this sense, the righteous or just [*das Gerechte*]" (GA54:77–79). Out of this Latin family of words, Heidegger will proffer his history of metaphysics as one tethered to the Roman understanding of *rectus* (right, virtuous, good, upright, correct) as what belongs to *justitia*. Moreover, precisely because Nietzsche thinks justice from out of Roman *veritas*, *rectitudo*, and *justitia*, Heidegger insists, he cannot ultimately experience "the originary essence of truth" expressed in pre-Socratic *dikê*. As Heidegger will continue to emphasize, "*justitia* has a wholly other essential ground than does *dikê*, which essentially unfolds as *alêtheia*" (GA54:59).

By unthinkingly translating *dikê* as "justice" and placing it within the frame of a juridical-moral interpretation, Western thought completed a process begun by the Romans who translated *dikê* as *justitia* without experiencing the originary meaning of Greek *dikê* as a "showing" (*deiknymi*), a "pointing toward" (*deixis*) of the "pattern" or "sketch" (*deigma*) that being "brings to light" and "shows forth." This etymological cluster of terms all belongs within the phenomenological mode of indicating and showing whereas the Latin translation of *dikê* as *justitia* has its roots in *jus* – which signifies "law," "right," "decree," or "standing rule." In this turn from the phenomenological to the legal, Heidegger finds the outlines for another way to think through the history of being away from its Roman-Christian roots in law and morality. Instead Heidegger will think it as the fit (*dikê*)

of all entities (*phusis*) belonging together in a gathering (*logos*) marked by harmonic strife. As Heidegger puts it, "*dikê* stands for the being of entities as a whole"; hence, he claims, "being as *dikê* is the key to entities in their structure [*Gefüge*]" (GA40:175/177).

In attempting to think *dikê* in terms of fit (*Fug*) and jointure (*Fuge*) – in the sense of "what is fitting," that which, when it is joined together (*gefügt*), "fits" – Heidegger seeks to offset the metaphysics of subjectivity, representation, machination, and the *Ge-Stell* whereby entities stand at our disposal (*Verfügung*) as "resources" available on standing reserve for constant delivery and consumption. Here Heidegger draws on Heraclitus' vision of the world as a playful jointure of contending forces, as in the image of oppositional equipoise between bow and lyre (Fragment 51). As he reads it, Heraclitean *dikê* is understood less as an overarching order that determines entities than it is as a jointure granted by *phusis* that sets limits to the incursions of individual entities. Anaximander understood this as the balance or equilibrium of forces in contention with one another, limited within the limitless generation of entities whose ultimate fate is degeneration (*genesis/ phthora*). Within such an order of *dikê*, "justice" is neither a legal nor moral arrangement or decree, but instead the fitting ad*just*ment of each being to the fit of the play between *dikê* (*Fug*/jointure) and *adikia* (*Un-Fug*/disjointure). In his essay "The Saying of Anaximander," Heidegger writes: "*Dikê*, thought out of being as presencing, is the ordering, jointure-granting order that fits (*der fugend-fügende Fug*). *Adikia*, dis-jointure (*die Un-fuge*), is dis-order (*der Un-Fug*)" (GA5:357/269). Hence, where there is disorder, things are "out of joint" (*aus der Fuge*) (GA5:354/267).

What Heidegger attempts to name in his rendering of *dikê* as *Fug* is something that is ultimately incapable of being translated in the metaphysical registers of "justice" or "ethics." Here Heidegger will forgo both discourses as caught within the humanism of the subject and its ethical calculus of good and evil. Against this, Heidegger will attempt to think the ethicality of being and the fit/ jointure of all entities within the truth of being. Much as his thought of "originary ethics" offers a new language of poetic dwelling, the discourse concerning *Fug*, *Fuge*, *Gefüge*, and *Fügungen* shifts the focus away from the human subject to a fit beyond our ken, a translation that resists equivalence in the semantic gestures of correspondence. In attempting to find the balance of *dikê* and a fit measure for letting this order of originary justice hold sway, the human being is faced with the task of dwelling poetically, preparing the transition to another beginning for thinking.

Charles Bambach

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Fug GA39:253; GA40:169–78/171–81; GA43:240; GA52:100–02; GA54:135–43; GA78:162–69, 177–82, 200–03
Fuge GA65:81–83; GA66:382–84; GA75:94–95, 301–02
Fügung GA39:258; GA55:141–47, 160–66; GA65:7, 81–82, 274–75
Gefüge GA5:349/263; GA42:55–58; GA66: 335–37; GA88:12–23
(ferne) Verfügung ("distant injunction" as a political call from 1930s) GA16:110–11, 114/HR 111, 114; GA36/37:6, 268, 270, 273

FURTHER READING

Bambach 2013, Ziarek 2011

JUSTIFICATION (*GERECHTIGKEIT*). SEE JUSTICE.

K

KNOW (*ERKENNEN*). SEE COGNITION.

KNOWLEDGE (*ERKENNTNIS*). SEE COGNITION.

L

121.
LANGUAGE (*SPRACHE*)

Language is the structure of meaning that correlates with the structure of being. As Heidegger puts it in his later work, language is "saying as showing" – a showing that is disclosive of and responsive to being and that lets entities appear. Human beings dwell within the disclosure of language and speak by being at home with this structure or by "listening" to this disclosure.

Language (*Sprache*) is a central element in Heidegger's thought, from the early writings on. A key question concerns the relation between language and being. Philosophy traditionally has understood this relation along the lines of the subject–object divide, where language "signifies" mental states that "represent" entities and their properties. Heidegger's approach differs in advancing a correlative structure of language and being, which is not a matter of representations and entities but existential meaning in the pre-theoretical concerns of the lived world. In the early works the correlation of language and being is shown in the central role played by interpretation in phenomenology. In *Being and Time* Heidegger insists that philosophy is not the discovery of free-standing facts or truths that can ground inferences in unadulterated, fixed foundations. Philosophy can only work within already operating elements (practices, social relations, language uses, inherited traditions) that cannot be put aside in thinking about the world. Philosophical reflection, therefore, is "interpretation" of pre-reflective elements of Dasein's world-involvement. In §32 of *Being and Time*, Heidegger calls interpretation the articulation of Dasein's pre-ontological understanding of being; and articulation is then fleshed out in §§33 and 34, which deal with assertion (*Aussage*), discourse (*Rede*), and language (*Sprache*). Interpretation therefore is essentially a matter of language, and in particular a matter of philosophical language.

What is the extent of the relation between language and being in *Being and Time*? In "Letter on 'Humanism,'" Heidegger issues a conviction that characterizes his later thought: language is the "house of being" (GA9:333/254), which seems to forego any radical distinction between language and being, since language is "the clearing-concealing advent of being itself" (GA9:326/249). Heidegger's early writings seem less radical in that language in *Being and Time* is presented as *one* of Dasein's fundamental existential bearings – along with understanding (*Verstehen*) and disposedness (*Befindlichkeit*) – and since various analyses of assertoric truth seem to differentiate the language of assertions from a more original experience of being-in-the-world. But such a periodic shift on the question of language may not be as pronounced as it might seem.

In §33 of *Being and Time*, Heidegger discusses assertion (*Aussage*) as a derivative mode of interpretation. Here he seems to confine the analysis of assertions to the theoretical sense of propositional judgment (*Urteil*). Heidegger delineates three elements of an assertion: pointing out (*Aufzeigen*), predication, and communication (*Mitteilung*), the last of which is called a "speaking forth" (*Heraussage*). He then states that assertion is thoroughly embedded in concernful being-in-the-world, the various kinds of enacted involvement that make assertion possible. He reiterates the available–occurrent dynamic and says that assertions turn

available (*zuhanden*) entities into occurrent (*vorhanden*) "objects" of reference. In this way the existential-hermeneutical AS-STRUCTURE of being-in-the-world is modified into the apophantical as-structure of discrete things with properties, cut off from the wider field of concernful engagements (SZ 153–60).

This section of the text immediately precedes the section on language (34), but the analysis of assertion in §33 brings up language in a manner relevant to the question at hand. Heidegger writes that *in between* wholly absorbed concernful COPING and propositional assertions about occurrent entities there is a range of "intermediate assertions about the happenings in the environment." And these spoken *sentences* cannot be traced back to theoretical propositions because they have their own disclosive meaning in those contexts (SZ 158). The coming analysis in §34 actually emphasizes discourse (*Rede*) over language (*Sprache*). It is important to take discourse (*Rede*) in its specific sense of "talk," of face-to-face conversation. Previously in the text, discourse had been connected with *logos* (SZ 25). In another early work Heidegger says that the Greeks had no word for "language" in our sense of the term; *logos* simply meant speech (GA20:365). Discourse is called the precondition for language, so that "language" is understood as specific expressions of speech as distinguished from concrete practices of talking, which seem to have phenomenological priority over focused attention on linguistic forms per se. As Heidegger puts it: "there is language only because there is discourse, and not conversely" (GA20:365). In *Being and Time*, the emphasis on face-to-face talk also includes various "nonverbal" elements of speech practices: gestures, facial expressions, intonation, rhythm, silence, listening, and responding (SZ 162–63).

It seems clear that language is a pervasive force throughout Dasein's being-in-the-world, because in §34 Heidegger tells us that only from an analytical standpoint do we *now* come to the question of language, because obviously it had already been operative in all the previous discussions of MOOD, disposedness, understanding, interpretation, and assertion. Language as communicative discourse is EQUIPRIMORDIAL with all other elements of Dasein's disclosedness (SZ 161). The hermeneutical as-structures preceding apophantical as-structures cannot be non-linguistic if the hermeneutical is a matter of interpretation, which is a matter of articulation in language. Indeed, not only is language equiprimordial *with* understanding and mood, at one point Heidegger says that understanding and mood are "determined equiprimordially" *by* language (SZ 133).

Heidegger reiterates this discussion of language in *Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics* (GA29/30:492–507). In line with the intermediate assertions mentioned in *Being and Time*, Heidegger talks of "spontaneous utterances" (e.g., the board is badly positioned) in which we "speak out of" disclosive "wholes" in everyday contexts of meaning, which function "without any instruction or theoretical reflection," that is to say, "specific contexts" of speech that LOGIC and epistemology overlook (502–04). These contexts display Dasein's "pre-logical being open for entities, *out of which* every *logos* must speak," a "pre-logical manifestness of entities *in* the *logos*" (505, emphasis added). An ambiguity about language is evident in these two passages: a pre-logical openness to being *out of* which language speaks, together with this openness manifested *in* language.

The ambiguity may be inevitable because phenomenological reflection cannot help but *distinguish* language from lived practices and their meaning. Yet apart from reflection, in everyday life language itself is a lived practice caught up in existential engagements, wherein we do not attend to "language" but rather the meaningful situations in which our talk is *immersed*. Such immersion opens up the way in which language and being-in-the-world are a correlative whole. The intimacy of language and being is specifically addressed in Heidegger's

1935 text, *Introduction to Metaphysics* (GA40:95ff.), where the "grammar of being" is illustrated in the various kinds of sentences operating with the verb "to be" (for instance, "The dog is in the garden," "The book is mine," "He is dead"). Each case of an "is" will indicate not just words, but a way of being, which can be understood only when "we take this saying of the 'is' as it actually happens, that is, as spoken each time from out of a particular situation, task, and mood, and not as mere sentences and stale examples in a grammar book" (GA40:95/94).

Returning to *Being and Time*, it seems that Heidegger is *not* radically differentiating language and the disclosedness of being, because a more original *orientation* toward language allows for bridging the difference. This is especially relevant with respect to the question of truth, which in the text is treated in §44, where the truth of assertions is originally an "uncovering" of the being of entities (*Entdeckend-sein*) and not simply a correspondence between a proposition and a state of affairs (SZ 218ff.). The notion of uncovering predates Heidegger's later emphasis on unconcealment (*Unverborgenheit*), which is meant to translate the Greek word for truth, ALÊTHEIA (see GA9:177–202/136–54). It can be said that Heidegger's espousal of a primal "pre-propositional" truth is *not* something pre-linguistic. Pre-propositional truth can involve immediate speech acts that are therefore not prior to language, but rather prior to the conversion of living utterances into abstract, theoretical references called "propositions." This would help explain the mixed messages in Heidegger's discussion of assertions in *Being and Time*. In a concrete circumstance, the utterance "the hammer is too heavy" gives a primordial interpretation "not in a theoretical statement but in an action of circumspective concern." Yet this action is something "expressed," a linguistic act that need not be construed as an "assertion" in a technical propositional sense (SZ 157). Heidegger suggests a non-technical sense in referring to an experiential "holding" (*Behalten*) of an assertion that is not a representational procedure, but "is itself a way of being-in-the-world" (SZ 62). In direct situations of communicative speech, language can be immediately world-disclosive in a "non-propositional" sense, without our wondering about the relationship between propositions and things. If someone says in a concrete situation, "this is the right tool to use," the effect of disclosiveness here does not follow a correspondence-linkage, but rather appropriate showing or pointing out, *in* language. It is crucial to stress the communicative element of speech here because the cogency of such an example shines in depicting speech *partners* pointing-out, speaking-out (*aussagen*) to each other in immediate circumstances of disclosive conversation. Discourse, as the practice of communication, is therefore always an understanding-with (*Mitverstehen*), in line with the being-with (*Mitsein*) character of being-in-the-world (SZ 162).

It helps to notice Heidegger's claim that *in practice* language in general, and even signs, can operate in an available (*zuhanden*) manner of immediate disclosedness (SZ 82–83, 161, 224). We are told in another early lecture course that linguistic expression (*Sprachausdruck*) "need not be simply theoretical or even object-specific, but is primordially living and experiential (*erlebend*)" (GA56/57:117). Assertions (*Aussagen*) are *acts* of meaning (*Bedeutungsakte*), which are an "expressedness" (*Ausdrücklichkeit*) of lived experiences or comportments (*Verhaltungen*) – *by way of* their meaning (GA20:74). The meaning of what is said has priority over any examination of the elements of language, even of the origins of language (GA20:287–88).

Language and being, therefore, are not separate spheres. Not only does language enact the as-structures that articulate the fore-structures of Dasein's understanding, even an "experience" of something without speaking carries articulation with it if it is a *meaningful* experience (SZ 149). Even our "simplest perceptions," Heidegger says elsewhere, are

already expressed, even more, are *interpreted* in a certain way. . . . What is primary and original here? It is not so much that we see the objects and things but rather that we first talk about them. To put it more precisely: We do not say what we see, but rather the reverse, we see what one says about the matter. (GA20:75)

We can grasp this idea more deeply if we consider child development and language acquisition, which help shape a child's meaningful engagement with the world. In any case there are two ways in which language is not something separable from concernful being-in-the-world: (1) speech practices are pre-*propositional* modes of disclosure; and (2) language seems to inform other modes of being-in-the-world.

Heidegger's later reflections on language can be gathered initially in the "Letter on 'Humanism,'" which instigates the so-called TURN (*Kehre*) from the phenomenology of Dasein to meditations on the SENSE of being itself. Yet such a turn was already forecast in *Being and Time*, and the early analysis of language likewise receives a deepened extension when being and language are correlated in a more pointed and dramatic manner. In "Letter on 'Humanism'" Heidegger specifically refers to §34 of *Being and Time* and its opening of the question of language in an ontological register. We are told that his reflections cannot be aligned with a "philosophy of language" that remains caught up in an ontical domain. He is inquiring into the "ESSENCE" (*Wesen*) of language, which indicates the way in which language is disclosive of being, not at a descriptive ontical level but an original unfolding of meaning at an ontological level.

> In its essence, language is not the utterance of an organism; nor is it the expression of a living thing. Nor can it even be thought in an essentially correct way in terms of its symbolic character, perhaps not even in terms of the character of signification. Language is the clearing-concealing advent of being itself. (GA9:326/248–49)

Heidegger's position is nothing like linguistic idealism, which is trapped in the subject–object divide. Language is disclosive of, and responsive to, *being*; it is "the house of being," in which human beings dwell and guard being (GA9:333/254). Language does not create being, but without language being would be concealed. At the same time, the unconcealment of being in language itself retains a kind of concealment in its correlational structure. What could one *say* about the origin of saying, about what lies at the threshold of language? No articulation in language can capture the full sense of being's coming-into-the-open through language. This is why Heidegger says that thinking about language at a fundamental level may exceed "expression" and require a "proper silence" (GA9:344/262).

At the close of the "Letter on 'Humanism'" Heidegger mentions POETRY in relation to the limits of philosophical articulation. Poetry may help a "THINKING" that does not presume philosophical methods or aims, that can provide a more vibrant approach to the unapproachable, the "poverty of its provisional essence" (GA9:362–64/275–76). This kind of reflection launches the later Heidegger's emphasis on "poetical thinking" as a pathway to the correlation of language and being. The creative, world-disclosive character of poetry fits the emergent dynamic of being and marks an alternative to representational theories of language. The meaning-disclosive character of poetical tropes also counters the dominant form of objective, instrumental, calculative rationality that drives the modern technological era. Poetical language had been briefly mentioned in *Being and Time* as a disclosure of existential possibilities (SZ 162),

and the 1935 essay, "The Origin of the Work of Art," had laid out the path for Heidegger's thinking on this matter. Poetry in that text is advanced as a special mode of ART's power of unconcealment, where the bringing-forth of world-disclosive meaning is constituted by cre-atedness: in its production, its novelty, and its power to show the sheer "that it is" of being (GA5:44ff./33ff.). Poetry is a "founding" (*Stiftung*) of truth in the manner of a historical bestowal (*Schenken*), a non-subjective grounding (*Gründen*), and an INCEPTION (*Anfang*) of a historical DESTINY (GA5:63ff./47ff.). Heidegger obviously has a certain kind of poetry in mind: think of Homer's epics or the works of Hölderlin, which came to occupy much of Heidegger's later thinking. In any case, poetry marks the greatest depth of art's disclosive power because of the primacy of language in the unconcealment of being (GA5:60ff./45ff.).

Two essays from the late 1950s, published in *Unterwegs zur Sprache* (GA12), offer some of Heidegger's most concentrated reflections on language. In "The Essence of Language" Heidegger calls for an *experience* with language as something not of our own making, an event that "overwhelms and transforms us" (GA12:149/OWL 57). In everyday speech, language *itself* withdraws, but it does show itself when giving or withholding the appropriate word in the work of a poet who is trying to speak something never yet spoken (GA12:150–52/OWL 59). Language itself speaks in Stefan George's poem "The Word," particularly in the last line: "Where the word breaks off no thing may be" (GA12:153ff./OWL 60ff.). The poetic word is not a "sign" for something that already "is" because "the word alone gives being to the thing" (GA12:155/OWL 62). Here Heidegger reiterates the "house of being" metaphor, and the poet is now emphasized as a house builder in a sense, yet as the one "called" to the word that gives being, and thus not a full creator in the active sense. The poet practices renunciation in the granting (*Zusage*) that happens in the creative process (GA12:165–66/OWL 71–72). George's poem provides a form of thinking that differs from philosophical analysis because the poet's renunciation reaches beyond the word as such to the word–thing *relation*, which by necessity is a MYSTERY exceeding description (GA12:167ff./OWL 74ff.). The conclusive line in the poem speaks of the age-old relation between being and saying, which Heidegger maintains was originally uttered as *logos* (GA12:174/OWL 80).

Such is the kind of thinking evinced in George's poem, but Heidegger insists that poetry and thinking must still retain a distinction. Both are a saying, but poetry's saying is a singing, while thinking's saying is a meditative REFLECTION (*Besinnung*, GA12:184/OWL 89). It seems that poetry's artistic powers are not identical with reflective possibilities in a poem. Yet poetry and thinking interact by dwelling in a nearness, which Heidegger names *Ereignis* (GA12:185/OWL 90), which indicates a happening through mutual ADAPTATION. In another text, Heidegger says that poetry and thinking are the "same," which is not an identity but "the belonging-together of that which differs, through a gathering by way of the difference" (GA7:196–97/PLT 218). The reciprocity of poetry and thinking is an adaptation (*Ereignis*) allowing "that saying in which language grants its essential nature to us" (GA12:185/OWL 90).

The original saying in poetical thinking precedes any objectification of language, such as a focus on speech or organic features, and especially in the dominant model of signification marking all theories of language since Aristotle, who marked letters as signs of vocal sounds, which are signs of mental states, which are signs of things (GA12:191–92/OWL 96–97). Signification is parasitic on the already emergent event of language. It should be noted that Heidegger also departs from traditional theories that diminish "physical" aspects of language in favor of meaning-content. While not espousing any material reductionism, Heidegger

ruminates on the vocal-aural character of language: its melody, rhythm, and tone, the "kinship of song and speech," where it is as much the nature of language to "sound and ring and vibrate, to hover and tremble," as it is to carry meaning (GA12:193–94/OWL 98).

The essay "The Way to Language" covers similar ground, while emphasizing the circular difficulty of trying to say *in* language what language "is." Language cannot be explained, described, or interpreted without already being in place *as* what allows something like explanation, description, or interpretation. Language therefore is a special kind of mystery that cannot be "grasped," that can only speak out of itself (GA12:229/OWL 111). As Heidegger puts it in another text in GA12, the best we can say in a positive sense is simply "language speaks" (*Die Sprache spricht*, GA12:11/PLT 188). The essential being of language is a "saying as showing" (GA12:242/OWL 123). Language shows in the sense of letting-appear, of bringing to light in the manner of unconcealment. But philosophy came to differentiate the showing from what is shown, and thus to distinguish words as "signs" for "things." Now language itself becomes an entity, something present as an object of investigation (speech, sounds, bearers of meaning, a human faculty), rather than the coming-to-presence of entities in the first place (GA12:233–34/OWL 115), including the coming to presence of "signs" and even "man" (GA12:242/OWL 123). In an original sense it is not human beings that speak; rather, *language* speaks. Human beings speak by "listening" to language. All PERCEPTION and conception is already shown in the original saying that is language (GA12:243/OWL 124). Saying is not some expression added to things after they appear, because all appearing and disappearing is grounded in saying as showing (GA12:246/OWL 126).

Once again Heidegger designates this disclosive opening of being in language as adaptation (*Ereignis*), the appropriating event of coming to presence in saying, which cannot be explained because it alone grants any possible mode of being (GA12:246–47/OWL 127). Adaptation (*Ereignis*) is called a way-making that moves saying into the sounded words of language, into speech (GA12:250/OWL 130–31). Such essential saying necessarily withdraws as such in order to free what is shown in saying (GA12:251/OWL 131). But the withdrawal of saying turns into an oblivion when language becomes objectified and formalized in modern "information systems," which are in the service of technological thinking. Such thinking eclipses the closeness of "natural languages" to saying, in the manner of self-showing *phusis* rooted in historical bestowals (GA12:252/OWL 132–33). This has nothing to do with scientific naturalism, but rather the embeddedness of human language in an already manifesting process. Heidegger even says that the proper approach to language does not require novel words or phrases(!), but rather a transformed *relation* to what language has already shown in its saying (GA12:255–56/OWL 135).

A later text that specifically focuses on the matter of language and adaptation (*Ereignis*) is "Time and Being." Heidegger begins and ends this essay with a warning about its presentation in "propositions" (*Aussagesätzen*), which are an obstacle (*Hindernis*) to addressing the MATTER (*Sache*), or the concern of the text, which is an *experience* of adaptation (*Ereignis*) and what withdraws in the appropriating event that "gives" being (GA14:6, 10, 29–30/TB 2, 5, 24). Yet once again there seems to be an essential ambiguity in this essay on the question of language, propositions, and an experience of being. Especially relevant is the *Protokoll* of the lecture appended to the main text (GA14:33–64/TB 25–54). The protocol is called an experiment (*Versuch*) that attempts to open up an experience of the matter of the text by way of a conversation between participants (including Heidegger), with their questions, answers, and

statements pointing to something that exceeds such linguistic forms (GA14:33–34/TB 25–26). A central question is the role of ontic "models" (*Modelle*) in the lecture (e.g., extending, giving) in relation to the matter of *Ereignis* and *Enteignis*, the revealing/concealing event of adaptation, which exceeds all ontic references (GA14:60–61/TB 50–51). A model is not a small-scale measure for thinking, but rather "that from which thinking must necessarily take off as a natural pre-requisite," in such a way that this from-which (*Wovon*) is at the same time the with-which (*Womit*) of the taking-off. Models are necessary because "the language of thinking can only start from (*ausgehen*) natural speech." Thinking deploys models to work from them (*abarbeiten*) to perform and consummate or ACTUALIZE (*vollziehen*) the TRANSITION (*Übergang*) to thinking. With this imagery of language as a with-which in a course of taking-off and going-over, it should be noted that *Hindernis* can mean an obstacle as *part of* a process of movement, as in the hurdles of a steeplechase.

The relation between natural language and the language of thinking requires an "essential interpretation" of language. Heidegger gives priority to natural language over formalized language, as long as "natural" is understood not naturalistically but according to the self-manifesting character of *phusis*. Although language in the main has an ontic character, ontological thinking must use ontic models because it can only make something manifest through words. But in addition to language's ontic-ontological character, we can ask about the possibility of a language that can speak the "simplicity" (*Einfache*) of language, in such a way that "the language of thinking precisely makes visible the limitations of metaphysical language." Natural language provides an alternative opening because it "is not at first metaphysical. Rather our interpretation of ordinary language is metaphysical, bound to Greek ontology. But man's relation to language could transform itself analogous to the change of the relation to being" (GA14:61/TB 51).

There appears to be a common trajectory in Heidegger's reflections on language and being: both need to be rescued from metaphysical governance by penetrating their self-manifesting emergence in pre-theoretical experience, which has its roots in Heidegger's early phenomenological works but receives more concentrated attention *as* a given domain in the later writings. At any rate, such a joint story shows that language is the core phenomenon in Heidegger's thinking of being. As he puts it in *Introduction to Metaphysics*: "the question about *being* will be most intimately intertwined with the question about *language*" (GA40:55/54). Indeed ontology itself is defined as "the strenuous effort to put being into words" (GA40:44/43).

Lawrence J. Hatab

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA4; GA21; GA38; GA39; GA52; GA53; GA85

FURTHER READING

Bernasconi 1985, Kockelmans 1972, Lafont 2000, Powell 2013, Wrathall 2011, Ziarek 2014

LAY BEFORE (*VORSTELLEN*). SEE REPRESENTATION.

122.
LEAP (*SPRINGEN*)

"Leap" names either (1) the process or event by which something springs from (*entspringt*) an origin (*Ursprung*) or source, or (2) the transition to a new condition that is incalculable or unpredictable in terms of the old.

Heidegger employs "leap" in the first sense mainly if the knowledge of the origin is necessary for a correct understanding of a phenomenon. It is also ubiquitous in interpretations and translations of Greek expressions, particularly in the case of the pre-Socratics and Aristotle.

"Leap" in the second sense prevails in the works on the HISTORY OF BEING and designates there the transition to the second or other INCEPTION. Such a transition is incalculable and leads to an open situation devoid of all the meanings established through the METAPHYSICS which the first inception of Greek thinking instantiated. Heidegger signifies by *leaping* especially the suddenness of the transition and the fact that a chasm needs to be overcome for leaving the order of the first and entering the era of the other inception.

While some employments of *springen* – the German word translated here as "leap" – clearly have an idiomatic instead of a conceptual character (see, e.g., "eye-catching," *in die Augen springen*, SZ 64; "at the ready" or "is about to," *auf dem Sprung sein*, SZ 344 and GA5:372/280; "leap over one's shadow," GA40:208/214), *springen* is in German semantically and in Heidegger's work also conceptually related to the lexical field that is captured by the English notions "primordial," "origin," "spring from," "spring forth," "passing over," "leaping over," "leaping after," "leaping ahead," "leaping into," "arise," and "runaway."

1. "Primordial" or "originary" (*ursprünglich*) designates how something is when it springs from its origin. For instance, Heidegger defines in *Being and Time* the aim of the existential analytic of *Dasein* as "to bring into relief phenomenally the unitary primordial structure of Dasein's BEING, in terms of which its possibilities and the ways for it 'to be' are ontologically determined" (SZ 130). For Heidegger a phenomenon is primordial if it cannot be derived from others (cf. SZ 131). However, this "does not rule out the possibility that a multiplicity of characteristics of being may be constitutive for it. If these show themselves, then existentially they are equiprimordial (*gleichursprünglich*)" (*ibid*.; see EQUIPRIMORDIALITY). Primordiality, therefore, is not synonymous with "the simplicity and uniqueness of an ultimate structural element" (SZ 334).

It is crucial for the existential analytic to determine the primordial level – not in order to establish safe ground, but as a methodological mean against "falling back upon the allurements of the way in which being is ordinarily understood" (SZ 387). The ordinary understanding of being is marked by interpretations which were derived from specific ways in which Dasein confronts what by these very confrontations is shaped as the world. The sources of these interpretations are accordingly the actions from which they spring. But even more primordial, those actions are the expression of a capability to engage with the environment. Heidegger insists on the indeterminateness of such a capability and concludes that "possibility as an

existentiale is the most primordial and ultimate positive way in which Dasein is characterized ontologically" (SZ 143f.). All determinate understanding rests in the last instance on the realization of the existential possibility.

The existential analytic of the primordial level is necessary, since the realization of the POSSIBILITY as an existentiale creates a world which subsequently conceals the most primordial and ultimate positive way in which Dasein is characterized ontologically. Heidegger calls the persistence of realized possibilities FALLING (*verfallen*). "In falling, Dasein *itself* as factical BEING-IN-THE-WORLD, is something *from* which it has already fallen away.... [I]t has fallen into the *world*, which itself belongs to its being" (SZ 176). This process is inevitable and has always already taken place. Therefore, the existential analytic like HERMENEUTICS must start from actual interpretations; for "INTERPRETATION must in any case already operate in that which is understood" (SZ 152). Yet, for Heidegger, in such a (hermeneutical) circle "is hidden a positive possibility of the most primordial kind of knowing" (SZ 153). The phenomenological method tries to demonstrate the connection of actual interpretations and their primordial origins by showing how the multiplicity of such origins is "united in their structure" (SZ 335). The structural unity and its effects *spring from* the (most *primordial*) *origin*.

2. "Passing over" (*überspringen*) means missing the true origin of something. For instance, Heidegger describes traditional ontology, in contrast to the existential analytic, as *passing over* of the relevant phenomena (cf. SZ 65f.). The allegation is that traditional ontology, by missing the true origin of a concept (e.g., "world"), fails to provide a sufficient understanding of such concepts and just repeats ordinary preconceptions. All in all, passing over describes a lack of sensitivity. This lack of sensitivity results from the falling which sprang itself from the primordial origins. Passing over is an effect of Dasein's energy, which Heidegger represents in the conceptualized metaphor of springing from a source. The same holds for the expression *leaping after* (*nachspringen*) which Heidegger introduces as a fallen version of springing from (cf. SZ 347, 369), and which designates the misleading of Dasein's energy. The existential possibility exhausts itself in cursory changes by leaping after all kinds of attractions. Thus, Dasein remains fixated on the present.

3. "Leaping over" means getting beyond obstacles. Heidegger's German term, *überspringen*, is the same used in the sense of "passing over." But in his work on the history of BEYNG, he strikingly modifies its use from having the negative connotation of a passive slip, to the actively sought and desired *leaping over* (cf. GA65:238, 251). This transition results from a change in the perspective of Heidegger's analysis. In *Being and Time*, Dasein enjoys a structural unity which includes a basic role for POSSIBILITY in its constitution. In contrast, in the history of beyng this possibility that most fundamentally characterizes Dasein is something that is achieved only with great difficulty, and requires us to overcome an established order.

4. In the mid-1930s, Heidegger elaborates the notion of "origin" (*Ursprung*) as the founding and subsequent preservation of a developing order of meaning. He describes the enduring presence of the origin in what is originated as "a leaping-ahead in which everything to come is already leapt over, even though as something veiled" (GA5:64/48). His paradigm examples of such an origin are the first and other inception, but also ART which "allows truth to arise [*entspringen*]. Art arises as the founding preservation of the

truth of entities in the work. To allow something to arise, to bring something into being from out of the essential source in the founding leap [*Sprung*] is what is meant by the word 'origin' [*Ursprung*]" (GA5:65f./49).

Heidegger generates this new understanding of "origin" and "springing from" in his lecture course on *Hölderlin's Hymns "Germania" and "The Rhine"* (GA39) in the winter of 1934/35. There, the Rhine is a metaphor of a historical development and its interpretation. Heidegger employs in this context the additional meaning "runaway" (as in "a runaway captive or slave") of *entsprungen* (i.e., the past participle of *entspringen*) when he speaks of the origin "that is initially fettered within itself" (GA39:200) and from which the river "sprung forth." From this origin the stream receives its force but not its orientation. "Just as the origin that has merely sprung forth is not the origin, neither is it the merely fettered origin . . . the springing forth itself first comes to be what it is as the river runs its entire course; it is not limited to the beginning [*Beginn*] of the course. The entire course of the river itself belongs to the origin" (GA39:202). Finding an orientation and expressing the energy of a source merge into one process. As a result the origin is more than a mere start. It is an enduring presence.

> The pure origin is not that which simply releases something other from itself and abandons it to itself, but rather that INCEPTION [*Anfang*] whose power constantly leaps over what has sprung forth, outlasts it in leaping ahead of it, and is thus present in the grounding of that which remains. It is present not as something that merely has a residual effect from earlier, but as that which leaps out ahead, that which, as commencement, is thus at the same time the determinative end – in other words is authentically the destination. (GA39:241)

In "The Origin of the Work of Art," Heidegger states that the enduring presence of the origin must be conceived as an ongoing actualization and not as a determination. "Self-assertion of essence is, however, never a rigid fixation on some condition that happens to be the case, but rather a surrendering into the hidden originality of the source of one's own being" (GA5:35/26f.). Obviously, this is rather a prescription than a description, even in the case of art (cf. GA5:66/49). In the *Contributions to Philosophy*, the enduring presence shifts from the first inception of Greek thought to the patterns of metaphysics which sprang from this "origin of philosophy" (GA65:59) and are the obstacle for the other inception. Now *leaping over* is overcoming this particular "entrenchment." "The leap into [*Einsprung*] the other inception is the return to the first and vice versa" (GA65:185). Contrary to SZ 153, in the *Contributions*, everything is about "to get out of the circle" that determines our current understanding. Yet, the way to leap over our ways of understanding and to leap into the other inception is still to restore the originality of the first. Even the preparation to such a leap "must already be a leaping and, as preparatory, must originate in and spring from [*abspringend*] the confrontation (interplay) with the first inception and its history" (GA65:229; see also GA40:7f./6 f.).

From *Being and Time*, there is no "immediate transition" (GA65:233) to the questions of the *Contributions*. Yet, Heidegger does not repudiate the analysis that he presented in *Being and Time*. Instead he qualifies it as "the transition to the leap (the asking of the basic question)" (GA65:234). While *Being and Time* was about the guiding question of how to understand the being of entities, the basic question concerns what Heidegger calls the basis of the guiding question: what is the truth of beyng? (cf. GA65:176). The truth of beyng and hence the answer to the basic question is that Da-sein as a historical collective has the possibility to successfully self-project its existence.

> What is true and, thereby, entities as well are first determined out of the original [*ursprünglich*] essence of truth, indeed in such a way that now entities no longer *are*; instead *beyng* rises up [*entspringt*] toward "entities." In the other inception of thinking, beyng is therefore experienced as ADAPTATION, specifically such that this experience, as springing forth [*Erspringung*], transforms all relations to "entities." Henceforth humans – i.e., the essential human being and the few of that kind – must build their history out of Da-sein, i.e., above all, must effectuate entities out of *beyng* toward entities. Not only as before, such that being is something forgotten (merely and ineluctably intended in advance) but such that beyng, its *truth*, explicitly bears every relation to entities. (GA65:248)

The whole idea of leaping is here that "being is not reachable from any of the entities; since thus only an already projected being – not understood in its projectedness – is 'handed' over again" (GA70:110). But, beyng is not some transcendence which surpasses entities either. Therefore, "the task is not to surpass entities (transcendence) but, instead, to leap over this distinction and consequently over *transcendence* and to question inceptually out of beyng and truth" (GA65:250f.). This new relation to entities is a projection that "allows the 'there' [the *Da* of Da-sein] ... to spring forth as the site of the moment of some 'where' and 'when'" (GA65:236). "Beyng, as the essencing of adaptation, is thus not an empty indeterminate sea of determinability into which we leap from just anywhere inasmuch as we already 'are'" (*ibid*.). Rather, leaping is a self-projection of Da-sein which determines its own existence by such a projection if "the projecting one as projector does ... leap into the projected path as it opens up" (GA65:231).

   In this self-projection of Da-sein, thinking plays a major role as the "most genuine and broadest leap" – "not as though the essence of being could be determined on the basis of thinking (assertion) but because here, in knowledge of adaptation ... the possibilities of sheltering the truth in entities can be gauged most extensively" (GA65:237).

<div style="text-align: right">*Christian Schmidt*</div>

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Phenomenology as original science and self-world as its original field GA58:1–3, 26–29, also 85–87, 175–79, 203
***Springen* as phenomenological method/attitude** GA58:137
Leaping over to the originary meaning of Greek concepts GA5:329/248; GA40:16/15, 185/188
Mystery in the essence of the origin of language GA40:180/182

FURTHER READING

Polt 2006

123.
LEVELING (*EINEBNEN AND NIVELLIEREN*)

LEVELING OFF (NIVELLIEREN) names a general tendency to make phenomena accessible by reducing them to terms familiar to the common understanding. It is closely related to *leveling down* (*einebnen*), in which outstanding or exceptional features of certain phenomena are assimilated to average and well-known cases.

Both of these modes of interpretation are driven by the ANYONE (*das Man*). The anyone flees from the burdens of authentic existence, and in fleeing it levels off phenomena that disclose the authentic structure of existence. Further, the anyone tends to construe all possibilities in terms of an average understanding that is shaped by public norms. To exist as the anyone is not to be exceptional in any way that would challenge these norms, and in its concern for averageness the anyone levels down such exceptional features. "Every kind of priority gets noiselessly suppressed. Overnight, everything that is primordial gets glossed over as something that has long been well known. Everything gained by a struggle becomes just something to be manipulated. Every secret loses its force" (SZ 127). Since fleeing and the concern for the AVERAGENESS of existence largely coincide, leveling off and leveling down typically coincide, and the two terms often appear to be synonymous. The literal meaning of the terms is also very close. Both terms mean bringing something down to a lower level. (Colloquially, *nivellieren* can also mean "dumbing down.") *Nivellieren* derives from the Latin root of level via the French *niveau*, while *einebnen* comes from the German *Ebene*, which means plane.

The tendency to level off phenomena is related to covering them up (*verdecken*). Heidegger distinguishes three different modes of covering up. First, phenomena can be covered up if they have never been discovered. Second, phenomena may have once been discovered, but have been totally covered up, so that they are no longer accessible at all. Third, phenomena may have been discovered and covered up, but not totally, so that some semblance of the phenomena still appears. Such "covering up as disguising," Heidegger claims, "is the most frequent and most dangerous, for here the possibilities of deceiving and misleading are especially stubborn" (SZ 36). The task of PHENOMENOLOGY is to recover the genuine phenomena behind the disguises and so to enable a philosophical understanding of DASEIN and the intelligibility of entities. Phenomenology therefore often has to struggle against the tendencies of the common understanding, and often has to secure its grasp of the genuine phenomena in stark contrast to prevailing notions circulating in the anyone. Leveling off existential phenomena has produced philosophical misinterpretations, which Heidegger's phenomenology aims to correct. Three examples seem particularly pertinent.

A first example is the relation between the circumspect encounter of available EQUIPMENT and predicative ASSERTIONS. Heidegger claims that the possibility of understanding predications derives from a more originary practical engagement. The understanding switches over and covers up the availability of the equipment in order to discover OCCURRENT properties. This change-over of the understanding is crucial for the functioning of assertions. Since we can comprehend occurrent properties, we can use assertions to point out features of entities and

communicate about them from a disengaged stance. But at the same time, the change-over covers up the phenomenology of engaged practical understanding. Heidegger calls it a "discovery that covers up" (*verdeckendes Entdecken*). And this leads to a philosophy that views all entities as occurrent, rather than available. It "levels down (*Nivellierung*) the originary 'as' of circumspect construal to the as of occurrent determinations" and it does so by "pushing the 'as' back into the uniform plane (*Ebene*) of the merely occurrent" (SZ 158; see As-structure). (This is a case in which Heidegger uses both *nivellieren* and the metaphor of *Ebene*.)

A second example is the common way of construing death. Heidegger argues that properly grasping the prospect of our own death can help to recover an authentic understanding of ourselves and remove us from the dispersion into the anyone. However, this requires that we anticipate death as our own certain existential possibility that never ceases to be relevant. In the common understanding of the anyone, the phenomenon of death has been leveled down to an occurrent event that happens to everyone, some day. "Dying is leveled off (*nivelliert*) to an occurrence that affects Dasein, but belongs to nobody in particular. . . . Dying, which is in its essence irreplaceably mine, is inverted into a publicly occurring event that befalls the anyone" (SZ 253). One dies eventually, but not now. The prospect of death has lost its significance for the individual, and the phenomena have lost their philosophical relevance.

A third example is the common, or "vulgar," concept of time. Heidegger develops a phenomenology of "world time." In our concernful dealings we experience time as significant, datable expanses, as time to work, time to eat, etc. The common understanding levels off this experience of world time and grasps it in concepts as a pure, infinite sequence of empty, qualitatively indistinguishable moments. Heidegger calls this leveled-off version the "now-sequence" (*Jetztfolge*). "In the common interpretation of time as now-sequence, both datability and significance are missing. . . . The common interpretation covers them up. When these are covered up, the ecstatico-horizonal constitution of temporality gets leveled off" (SZ 422).

These different examples of leveling off share a common root in the anyone that flees from a proper understanding of its existential condition. It flees a proper understanding of death. Since it conceives of death as a far-off event and since the anyone as such never dies, time is conceived as an endless stream of moments. In such interpretations, existential phenomena are covered over, in favor of a conceptualization of existence in occurrent terms. Heidegger's existential phenomenology seeks to replace the ontology of the occurrent that frames the leveled-off, but dominant understanding of human existence.

Stephan Käufer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 127, 158, 194, 253, 329, 405, 421–27; GA17:146, 157–61; GA21:153–60

124.

LIFE (*LEBEN*)

"Life" can refer to the capacity for metabolic activity, or to merely animate being, or (in a metaphysical sense) to the capacity for the preservation and enhancement of conditions of existence, or to specifically worldly existence. By "factical life," Heidegger understood the living of life in the world (GA61:85/65). In the early 1920s it was for him a fundamental phenomenological category designating a basic phenomenon (GA61:80/61). Already in this early period he was preoccupied with the ambiguity and indeterminacy of the term *life*, but he initially saw the vagueness of factical life as something intrinsic to it because of its temporalizing (GA61:175/133). Subsequently, in *Being and Time* he presented the ontological indeterminacy of the term "life" as a result of the general failure to see the need to inquire about its being (SZ 46). He returned to the theme of life in earnest between, roughly, 1936 and 1942, in the context of his engagement with Nietzsche's account of the will to power. After initially seeming to hold out some hope of finally clarifying it ontologically, he eventually abandoned that attempt. Instead, the concept came to play a fundamental role in bringing him to the understanding that Western metaphysics was at an end and that the task of thinking was now the overcoming of metaphysics, that is to say, leaving it and categories like *life* behind. In recent years the term "life" has gained a great deal of prominence within French philosophy, but Heidegger's later attack on the notion of life has been largely ignored by scholars in favor of his early appeals to it.

Heidegger embraced the concept of life most enthusiastically during his first period of teaching at Freiburg University, which was between 1919 and 1923. He was already sensitive to the limitations of the philosophy of life, but in the context of a discussion of one of its foremost representatives, Wilhelm Dilthey, Heidegger presented life-philosophy as a necessary station on the path of philosophy to a philosophy of existence (GA9:14/13; GA59:154/119). Life was equally unavoidable in the later period, but for a very different reason. The term "life" had come to represent for him the bankruptcy of Western metaphysics at its end and to that extent a significant component of what had to be overcome in the overcoming of metaphysics. Heidegger was led to this conclusion in stages. Soon after the publication of *Being and Time* he called for "a metaphysical interpretation of life" (GA29/30:278) and it seems that it was in this spirit that he set out to read Nietzsche, for example, in his seminar from 1938–39 on *The Advantage and Disadvantage of History for Life*. In the course of doing so Heidegger came to recognize that Nietzsche was trapped by the concept of life, wanting to overcome it but unable to do so (GA46:116). This then became one of the main focal points of his reading of Nietzsche as the philosopher at the end of metaphysics. For Heidegger Nietzsche's focus on life was proof of the latter's lack of originality in his thinking (GA65:326/258).

Heidegger's assault on the concept of life was most public in his lectures on Nietzsche from 1939, *The Will to Power as Knowledge* (GA47). The context in which these lectures were given cannot be ignored. Some commentators were attributing a certain biologism to Nietzsche in an effort to bring him more in line with National Socialism, whereas others, including Alfred

Baeumler, criticized Nietzsche for his biologism, while at the same time arguing that Nietzsche's call for the extinction of degenerates provided a basis for founding the state on race. Heidegger's statements on this topic were far from uniform, but his considered opinion seems to have been that Nietzsche was biologistic as a consequence of his metaphysical interpretation of being as will to power (GA47:321). In these lectures Heidegger seemed initially to be trying to separate Nietzsche's concept of life from that of Darwin by distinguishing the enhancement of life from its preservation (GA47:22/N3 15), but he soon abandoned the attempt to build anything on this difference (GA50:17).

In his private manuscripts from the late 1930s and early 1940s Heidegger's more general hostility to the concept of life, which was widely deployed by some of the officially endorsed Nazi philosophers such as Ernst Krieck, was more openly articulated. In his manuscripts Heidegger charted the way that the concept of life had come to be understood as the drive for self-preservation (GA65:102–03/81) and so had been predetermined by the Darwinian "struggle for existence" (GA69:222) and in consequence made possible eugenics in the sense of racial breeding programs (GA69:70). However, even here Heidegger had not fully abandoned his early commitment to factical life as a basic phenomenon. This comes through in another text that can be dated to the period 1938 to 1940. He wrote: "life has no need of the concept in order to bear its vitality, but 'life' remains excluded from the relation to BEYNG" (GA69:99). When read in isolation, the formulation is enigmatic but two things at least are clear: first, that Heidegger had not lost touch with his early insight into the importance of the living of life in the world, and, second, that what he was attempting was less a direct philosophical assault on life as a metaphysical concept than an account of its role in the growing oblivion of being. Indeed, "life-enthusiasm" contributed to the scorn for thinking, as opposed to calculative planning, that flourished under "the banner of life" and thus prevented that thinking of the history of being that alone allows the being of the will to power to be clearly known (GA7 80/EP 93–95).

Robert Bernasconi

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA5:193–247/157–99 ("Nietzsche's Word 'God is dead'" includes Heidegger's final account of Nietzsche on life)
GA58:25–40 (Heidegger's preliminary delimitation of the concept of life)
GA61:79–155 (the most accessible of Heidegger's accounts of factical life)

FURTHER READING

Arrien 2014, Bernasconi 2012, Bernasconi 2013a, Campbell 2012

LIGHT (*SCHEIN*). SEE SEEMING.

LIGHTING (*LICHTUNG*). SEE CLEARING.

125.
LINGERING (*WEILEN*)

To linger is to tarry or to "while" (stay for a while) in appearance, in between an emergence and a passing away. Heidegger's principal concern over the whole of his lifetime of thinking was to show that an entity is always in some manner of movement or unfolding. Entities temporally "while" or "linger" or "abide" in their emerging and showing forth. Also, lingering characterizes the BEINGNESS of an entity, which had been traditionally set apart from its becoming.

For Heidegger, one of the most vexing issues left over from the metaphysical tradition of thinking was the relation of becoming and BEING. Plato's tendency was to understand the prevailing "full look" of something, its *eidos* or *idea*, as what something really is (*ontos on*). The *eidos* or *idea* (later the ESSENCE) of something was thus construed to be the timeless being of the entity. Accordingly, the becoming of an entity was less being, if not non-being. Aristotle rehabilitated becoming to some extent by maintaining that the form (*morphê*) of a being draws itself into place through becoming the "what it was to be" (*to ti en einai*, *Metaphysics* Z, 4, later also understood to be the essence of something). Yet, still for Aristotle, following Plato, the form of something is the timeless being of the entity.

Heidegger's effort to raise again the "question of being" was, in part, in order to arrive at a unified SENSE of being that could encompass both traditional notions of becoming and being. His fundamental insight was that being-as-time (as *phusis* and *alêtheia*) unfolds entities in such a way that both the movement (becoming) of entities and the "whiling, lingering, abiding" of entities (their beingness) can be seen as but two aspects of the single temporal-spatial way or process that is being itself. Thus the age-old metaphysical distinction between becoming (as potency) and being (as essence, act, actuality) was grounded by Heidegger in the onefold of the being-way (or being-process) itself.

In Heidegger's thinking, therefore, the traditional understanding of the beingness of an entity does not refer to a timeless essence, but rather to a manner of temporalizing that he names in several ways. A being in its essential aspect is still in movement; that is, essence refers to a moving rest or stillness that he characterizes as "ingathering," "inabiding," or as "lingering" (*weilen*). He employed this word and its related forms over many years, but especially after 1940, and very prominently in his 1946 elucidation "Anaximander's Saying" (GA5). In this text, he plays with many variations of *weilen* in order to convey that a being, as originally understood by the Greeks, is what shows itself as temporally sojourning or tarrying in its place, or as he puts this in one of his formulations: "that which is presently present whiles for a while" (*Das gegenwärtig Anwesende weilt jeweils*, GA5:345/263).

Richard Capobianco

126.
LIVED BODY (*LEIB*)

THE LIVED BODY is the body as experienced immediately and directly by an agent, in contrast to the corporeal body (*Körper*) which is the body as an object of the external senses. Heidegger, out of his concern to divorce our experience of ourselves from the categories of the sciences of the OCCURRENT, invoked the notion of the lived body at certain key points in his work. But he never succeeded in developing a systematic and satisfactory account of the lived body.

German philosophy in the twentieth century, starting with Max Scheler, has developed the distinction between the lived body and the corporeal body. Scheler discovered the lived body through self-awareness experiments: if all bodily senses were abolished (seeing, hearing, etc.), no sense perception of the corporeal body would remain, but a perception of one's own lived body would still be present nevertheless. This includes, for instance, phenomena like pain, hunger, or itches. Also important is Scheler's indication of the holistic characteristics of the lived body such as "sturdiness," "freshness," "health," or "sickness," all of which he summarizes under the term "vital feelings" (*Lebensgefühl*, Scheler 1980, 397f., 340–42).

Even more important for Heidegger's relationship with this topic is Helmuth Plessner's book *The Levels of the Organic and Man*, released in 1928, in which Plessner introduces the thesis that the lived body is not identical with the corporeal body: when a human raises his arm, he makes use of muscles – this characterization only refers to the bodily process. The experience of the lived body though is, according to Plessner, not describable through a recourse to parts of the body like bones, tendons, muscles, vessels, nerves, et cetera (Plessner 1975, 35f.). Later, Plessner presents a bold formula: Human beings *have* a corporeal body, but *are* a lived body.

A peculiarity of Heidegger's position is that he only marginally acknowledges rudiments of a distinction between the lived body and the corporeal body. In, for example, *Being and Time*, he combines both expressions into the neologism "lived corporeal body" (*Leibkörper*, SZ 368), without any distinct awareness of the problems this conjunction of concepts creates. Only in his lectures in the 1930s is the topic given some attention in the context of the experience of feelings. A more intense (yet still deficient) examination takes place even later, during Heidegger's cooperation with the Swiss psychiatrist Medard Boss in the *Zollikon Seminars* (1959–69).

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger considers the "spatialization of being in one's lived bodily nature [*Leiblichkeit*]" as a "separate problem for another day" (SZ 108). The word is put in conspicuous, distancing quotation marks. When in 1972 Medard Boss confronts Heidegger with Sartre's remark that Heidegger has only given six lines of *Being and Time* to examining the lived body, Heidegger responds: "I can only answer to Sartre's accusation with the ascertainment that what is bodily [*das Leibliche*] is the most difficult [topic] and that I had not had anything more to say about it back then" (GA89:392). Problematically, Heidegger for the most part maintained a distanced and relatively undifferentiated relationship with the topic.

Put concretely, Heidegger distances himself from the problem of the body in two ways:

(1) Heidegger attributes talk of the lived body to a traditional anthropological thinking that he actually wishes to overcome (e.g., body–soul dualism).

(2) He also attributes talk of the lived body to a biological-physiological thinking that incorrectly reduces phenomena to materialistic aspects.

Concerning (1): early on, Heidegger demanded an abandonment of all "theoretically fully formed distinctions like lived body and soul, sensuality and rationality, corporeal body and mind and the like" (GA60:214). In such distinctions, the human being as such is only perceived "from the outside" as if it was but an object of distant "observation" (GA20:173, 207) or "depiction" (GA61:168; GA63:25; GA31:180f.). In such an objectifying external perspective a human being is constructed as a "multilayered worldthing," being turned into lived body, soul, and mind – the fundamental building blocks in a philosophical construction kit (GA20:172f., 207; GA65:312f.) – as occurred in the tradition of philosophical anthropology. This *composition* of ontologically indeterminate single pieces, to which the lived body usually belongs, is repeatedly criticized by Heidegger in the name of a proceeding wholeness thought of as *historical* or temporal-dynamical, e.g., as a "context of ACTUALIZATION" (GA60:109f.) or "sense of actualization" (GA61:52, 60). Heidegger uses different, negatively assessed formulae for the problematic composition of static anthropological elements: "summatively calculated" (SZ 48), "together-existing" (SZ 56), "synthesis" (SZ 117), "composite" (GA20:207; SZ 198), or "connection" (SZ 368). This criticism continuously appears in Heidegger's work (e.g., cf. GA36/37:214; GA38:68/59; GA65:312ff.).

Concerning (2): additionally, a different point of view treats the lived body in an isolated manner and locates it in the sphere of biology. In 1925, Heidegger appreciates Max Scheler's still-to-be-published anthropology, because he believes that through its consideration of "specific functions of a lived bodily nature [*Leiblichkeit*]" it will discover essential phenomena. Heidegger believed that Scheler especially worked out these "phenomena of biology" and had made extensive progress investigating them (GA20:303). In the 1930s, the lived body continues to be a subject of biology (GA36/37:214), and in his "Letter on 'Humanism'" Heidegger even warns about an "aberration of biologism," alleging that biologism believes the nature of men to be found in the scientifically explained body (*Leib*, GA9:324/247).

Simultaneously, Heidegger formulates a philosophical claim for the topic, questioning the sole authority of biology in that respect. In his anthropological stage (1929/30) he criticizes the "narrowness of this lived-body-based, somatic anthropology," because for it human nature amounts to nothing more than its bodily nature (*Leiblichkeit*, GA28:10). Conversely, the lived body needs to be protected from being viewed as "mere nature" (GA34:236). Human behavior should not be construed from the point of view of a "faunal biology" but rather bodily nature should be located within the EXISTENCE of a human being (GA36/37:178). In this attempt to liberate the lived body from biological-physiological reduction and to perceive it as a more comprehensive phenomenon, Heidegger occasionally achieves his own, more positive access to the topic itself. An ambivalence nevertheless always remains, because obviously the lived body is still being viewed as a problem sui generis, even after its liberation from traditional anthropology and biology. In 1929, Heidegger explains in Davos that being is tied to that which has being through a "captivation to the lived body," and by this constraint it can only exist in very rare moments at the "peak of its own possibility" (GA3:290).

In the second half of the 1930s, Heidegger links to Scheler contentwise by identifying feeling as self-feeling in the "way in which we are a lived body" (GA43:116f.). To be a lived body therefore is not an outward matter of biology any more, but rather a question of human affectivity. He also follows Plessner's drift by claiming: "We don't 'have' a body [*Leib*], but 'are' a body, and the feeling as a self-feeling belongs to the essence of this form of being" (GA43:117). Thus the lived body has come to be seen as an integral part of human being. For the first time it can be said that our lived bodily nature is taken seriously as something distinct from corporeality, though this approach remains inconsequent and half-hearted. Not until 1965 did Heidegger pointedly seize this topic, now distinguishing the lived body from the scientifically examined body by their distinct spatiality (GA89:109f.). Nevertheless, Heidegger does not offer even here a systematically satisfying clarification of the phenomenon.

Michael Großheim

127.
LIVED EXPERIENCE (*ERLEBNIS*)

L IVED EXPERIENCE IS a condition of being affected by the surrounding WORLD in such a way that the present situation is revealed in its specific meaning for the one who is affected. In his various expositions of Husserl and other philosophers, Heidegger mentions their concept of lived experience (for instance, GA20:130–45; GA24:90); but this remains outside his own theoretical commitments. However, speaking in his own voice, early Heidegger emphatically appropriates and recasts the notion of lived experience for his life-philosophical project during a brief period after World War I. In his 1919 lecture course *Zur Bestimmung der Philosophie* (GA56/57) Heidegger develops, in opposition to (unnamed) empiricist sense data theories, a concept of lived experience that accentuates the holistic, horizon-bounded, immersive, immediate, historical, eventful, personal, always meaningful, and (cognitively and affectively) disclosive character of lived experience with regard to the world in which one lives. He calls this the basic and irreducible "lived experience of the surrounding world" (*Umwelterlebnis*) (GA56/57:70–73).

Exemplifying this concept, Heidegger reflects on the lived experience that he and his students have of the lectern from where he is lecturing:

> In the lived experience of seeing the lectern something gives itself to *me* from out of the immediate world around me (*Umwelt*). This world around me (lectern, book, blackboard, notebook, fountain pen, beadle, fraternity student, streetcar, automobile, etc., etc.) consists not of things with certain significations, objects plus what is subsequently grasped as meaning this and that. Rather, what is primary and what is given immediately to me, without any detour through an objective apprehending in thought, is something meaningful (*das Bedeutsame*). Living within a surrounding world (*Umwelt*), each and every thing is meaningful to me at all times; everything is worldly, "it worlds." (GA56/57:72–73)

Because lived experience simultaneously bears "I" and "world" ("I" am "totally present" at the world and the world is totally present to me), allowing each to appear to the other, Heidegger characterizes lived experience as an event (*Ereignis*), in which "I appropriate" (*er-eigne*) the world, which "shows" and "unfolds" itself according to its own essence, such that coming into one's own and recognizing the world proper are two sides of the same coin (GA56/57:75).

Heidegger contrasts this worldly, holistic, historical, and ineluctably personal lived experience with the depersonalized, dehistoricized, objective, and theoretical experience or comportment in which a theoretical (universal and replaceable) I stands vis-à-vis decontextualized things or objects, ascertaining certain properties of them. The sympathetic band that connects "I" and "world" is broken here: "The OBJECT's being, or the thing's being as such no longer affects *me*. The I that makes a [theoretical] assertion [about an object], *I am* no longer. The experience of ascertaining [properties of an object] is only a torso of lived experience; it is de-lived experience (*Ent-leben*)" (GA56/57:74). The intensity and vivacity of lived experience has given way to a pale and impersonal registration of facts, unrelated to the personal life-world and the experiencing subject in it: "In the

theoretical comportment I am directed towards something, but *I* do not live (as an historical I) towards this or that worldliness" (GA56/57:74). In other words, the original worlding of lived experiences has been destroyed and broken up into a subject pole here and an object pole over there. Put differently, in the theoretical attitude we lose sight of the personal self and the surrounding world. It follows that one can postulate theoretical objectivity as the basic and primary reality only at the price of the alienation from self and world (GA58:183). Of course, Heidegger does not question the legitimacy of theoretical objectivity. Rather, he argues that the primary and ineluctable ground floor is lived experience, and that it alone constitutes the very origin from which all theoretical objectification takes its departure, and that we must not mistakenly reverse this by according "primacy" to theoretical objectivity and its objectifications (GA56/57:87).

Heidegger keeps essential elements of this analysis in *Being and Time*, but within the quite different ontological framework of DASEIN'S BEING-IN-THE-WORLD, based on UNDERSTANDING, DIS-POSEDNESS, and DISCOURSE, without any positive recourse to the earlier concept of lived experience.

In his later work Heidegger puts forth a novel, onto-historical interpretation of the centrality of lived experience (especially in terms of its commonly ascribed subjectivist and aesthetic meanings), seeing in it a symptom and manifestation of modernity's subjectivism. Heidegger holds that since modernity the SUBJECT stands at the center of reality, meaning that it is only on account of something's being represented by the subject that it counts as being. Put differently, only if something "is experienced and becomes a lived experience (*er-lebt und Erlebnis wird*)," has it validity in the economy of entities (GA5:94/71; see also GA65:129). This understanding of lived experience corresponds to the MODERN en-framing of being, according to which everything is understood from the angle of its technological makeability (*Machbarkeit*), manipulability, and usability – all of which Heidegger summarily calls "MACHINATION" (*Machenschaft*) (GA65:126) – because lived experience itself is nothing other than a product, the skilfully prepared, organized, and procured and provided content for the subject, i.e., the thrills and sensations, the endless novelties and titillating scandals, the exciting and exotic adventures, the intoxication and relief from the boredom of an ever more regimented existence within the "total unquestionableness of the age" (*Zeitalter der völligen Fraglosigkeit*) (GA65:107). The "hunt after exciting experiences" (*Jagd nach Erlebnissen*) is supported and showcased by the machinery of the culture industry (*Kultur-betrieb*, GA65:124). It is the manufactured *Ersatz* for genuine questionability, the way to pacify and "render harmless" the authentic call to heed what calls for THINKING, i.e., BEING (GA65:107). As such, machination and lived experience "belong together" (GA65:129). It lies "in the essence of both to know no limit, no humility, and absolutely no modesty at all. They are farthest removed from the power to preserve" (GA65:131).

<div align="right">*Ingo Farin*</div>

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA5:67–74/50–56; GA56/57:63–117; GA65:107–66.

FURTHER READING

Dilthey 1906, Gadamer 1990, 61–76.

LOCATION, LOCALE (*ORT, ORTSCHAFT*). SEE PLACE.

128.
LOGIC (*LOGIK*)

For heidegger, logic is the inquiry into the relation between Dasein and unconcealment.

The Greek *logos* can be translated as "speech" or "reason," but more fundamentally, it refers to the human ability to gather and comprehend the being of entities, to thoughtfully respond to the meaning and order of things, and consequently to discuss them in words. Heidegger's "logic" embraces this entire range of phenomena. Thus, in Heidegger's usage (as well as in the parlance of many German thinkers before the rise of logical positivism) logic includes topics that today would conventionally be classified as belonging to epistemology, philosophy of mind, metaphysics, and philosophy of language. Heidegger attempts to unite all these considerations by rethinking the human condition as Dasein, in its relation to truth as unconcealment.

Thus, "logic" in Heidegger does not refer exclusively to the formal analysis of inferences, much less to the quasi-mathematical version of such analysis in symbolic logic (*Logistik*). These narrower senses of logic are of philosophical interest only insofar as inferential reasoning is important to knowledge and understanding – that is, to truth.

In Heidegger's view, thought is not primarily rational, discourse does not primarily consist of assertions, and truth is not a property of assertions but rather a more fundamental unconcealment that is presupposed in all discourse – a disclosure of the world that is intrinsic to our being. On this basis, particular entities can be uncovered; and then, we may form assertions that promote such uncovering (SZ 156–57, 226). Thus, although it can be illuminating to use reason to infer some assertions from others, rationality and inference are neither fundamental nor exclusive sources of truth. Heidegger denies that this position is irrationalism (GA9:346/263; GA27:320): he does not reject reason, but attempts to put it in its proper place. For example, formal deductive logic, which forbids circular reasoning, is inappropriate to the thinking of being because it fails to shed light on the circularity that is necessary and productive in hermeneutic phenomenology (SZ 152, 315).

For Heidegger, then, logic in the narrow sense – the formal analysis of inferences – is of limited value. It cannot stand as a constraint on all thinking, or a touchstone of true or meaningful thought. This does not mean that Heidegger denies the correctness of logical principles in their proper domain, but he limits these principles to a secondary role. Formal logic can, at best, think *about* thinking; it cannot determine what is *worthy* of thinking or teach us how to think about it (GA51:19). Above all, formal logic should not determine ontology, although it has played an important role in the development of the metaphysical tradition.

Logic is a frequent topic in Heidegger's writings, beginning with his 1912 article "Recent Research on Logic." Here he mentions Frege and Russell, but criticizes symbolic logic for failing "to push ahead to the truly logical problems.... The deeper sense of the principles remains in the dark.... Mathematics and the mathematical treatment of logical problems arrive at limits where their concepts and methods break down – which is precisely where the

conditions of their possibility lie" (GA1:42–43). (For more on symbolic logic see, e.g., GA8:23/21; GA9:308/235; and on logic and computing, GA79:104–05.)

Heidegger's "logical" interests are already broad at this point. He is interested in developing logic as "theory of theory," a project that investigates the nature of judgment and the validity (*Geltung*) of thoughts. This validity is to be distinguished from physical existence or the performance of an act of thinking, so Heidegger, with Frege and Husserl, is strongly against psychologistic accounts of meaning and thought. (The concept of *Geltung* was developed by philosophers such as Hermann Lotze and Emil Lask. It resembles the Stoic concept of the *lekton*, or the propositional content of speech.) With Lask, Heidegger calls for the development of a "logic of philosophy" or even a "logic of logic" (GA1:288).

As Heidegger comes into his own as a thinker in early lecture courses such as *The Idea of Philosophy and the Problem of Worldview* (1919, in GA56/57), he rejects "theory of theory" in favor of an account of the non-theoretical basis of theorizing. Theoretical assertions and reasonings are rooted in the concretion of LIVED EXPERIENCE. We would falsify such experience if we discussed it in theoretical terms, as if it could be reduced to what can be described through assertions and inferences. The proper method of philosophy is thus "FORMAL INDICATION," a kind of discourse that points us toward the content of our own experience without presuming to exhaust that content (GA61:32–33).

Among the lecture courses that develop these ideas in the 1920s, the 1925–26 *Logic: The Question of Truth* (GA21) is particularly important. Heidegger begins with Husserl's critique of psychologism (e.g., in the 1900 *Logical Investigations*) and criticizes the concept of "validity" that he himself had formerly embraced. He then turns to Aristotle's discussion of truth and falsehood as aspects of propositional discourse, in which we assign a predicate to a subject and treat an entity *as* this or that. This "apophantic 'as'" depends on a more primordial "hermeneutical 'as'" – the interpreting activity that is central to our engaged being-in-the-world (cf. SZ 158; see AS-STRUCTURE). In passages that anticipate major portions of *Being and Time*, Heidegger describes the temporality of this BEING-IN-THE-WORLD or "CARE." By way of an interpretation of Kant's theory of time, Heidegger establishes that entities appear as OCCURRENT (*vorhanden*) and as appropriate objects of assertions only within one dimension of temporality, the present. Truth and understanding as a whole, then, cannot be limited to the theoretical assertions that have been the focus of traditional epistemology and formal logic. Assertions are forms of making-present, but presence is only one limited domain of temporality.

Accordingly, Heidegger sees traditional logic as bound by an unquestioned "ontology of the occurrent" (SZ 129; cf. SZ 157, 165). This logic tends to reduce all ways of being to the "is" of the copula; that is, it promotes the prejudice that assertions are definitive for thinking, truth, and being (GA24:252–320). In contrast, a fresh inquiry into being can serve as a "productive logic" that newly reveals various domains of entities, unfettered by the traditional obeisance to occurrentness (SZ 10). We might also then break through to a more original kind of language, freeing grammar from traditional logic (SZ 165).

In *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic* (GA26, 1928) Heidegger investigates Leibniz's theory of logic and truth as an offshoot of his metaphysics of the monad. This lecture course can be seen as a case study in the priority of the understanding of being over any formal theory of propositional discourse. Philosophers develop approaches to logic that fit their ontological position.

This is most evident in the case of Hegel, who explicitly identifies logic with metaphysics. Heidegger's confrontations with Hegel are found in GA32, GA36/37, GA68, and GA86. For Heidegger, Hegel's philosophy is "onto-theo-logic": that is, Hegel expounds his systematic account of entities as a whole and of the highest entity by means of his dialectical logic (see ONTO-THEO-LOGY). In Hegel's logic, "being" is the simplest and thus emptiest of concepts; it is superseded by the concepts of NOTHING, becoming, and determinate existence. Heidegger takes this as a quintessential metaphysical error: being is not an empty concept at all, but a rich gift bestowed by time and HISTORY.

For Heidegger, an account of Dasein's temporality must deal with phenomena that are far removed from assertion and formal logic, such as the experience of ANXIETY, in which the meaning of all entities is threatened by nothingness. In his 1929 lecture "What is Metaphysics?" Heidegger indicates this phenomenon through phrases such as "the nothing itself nihilates" (*das Nichts selbst nichtet*) and claims that "the idea of 'logic' itself disintegrates in the turbulence of a more originary questioning" (GA9:114/90, 117/92). Rudolf Carnap took such pronouncements as examples of illogical, metaphysical nonsense in his 1931 article "The Elimination of Metaphysics through Logical Analysis of Language" (see Carnap 1931). Because an utterance such as "the nothing nihilates" cannot be represented in symbolic logic, it has no meaning whatsoever. This logical positivist critique has prejudiced many analytic philosophers against Heidegger. Heidegger's reaction to Carnap can be found in the first draft of a portion of the 1935 lecture course *Introduction to Metaphysics*, where he characterizes logical positivism as "the uttermost reduction and deracination of the traditional theory of judgment under the illusion of mathematical scientificity" (GA40:228).

In a lecture course from his most politicized period, *Logic as the Question Concerning the Essence of Language* (GA38, 1934), Heidegger investigates *logos* as the LANGUAGE of a PEOPLE. Questions about logic in any restricted sense must be tied to broader questions about the essence of a community and its historical existence, for all unconcealment occurs within this context. "Who are we?" is a "logical" question in this sense, as well as a political one.

By the time of *Basic Questions of Philosophy: Selected "Problems" of "Logic"* (1937–38) Heidegger has developed his "HISTORY OF BEING," that is, a way of thinking that tries to grasp the happening or unfolding of being itself as ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*, also translated as "appropriating event"). On this basis he characterizes the interpretations of being that pertain to various epochs in the history of METAPHYSICS. In this context, the inquiry into truth is not a matter of "logic" as "a discipline of scholastically degenerated philosophical learnedness" (GA45:8), but "a confrontation with the whole of Western philosophy" (GA45:11) in preparation for a new beginning.

The 1944 lecture course *Logic: Heraclitus' Doctrine of Logos* (in GA55) is Heidegger's most thorough investigation of *logos*. A brief presentation of some of his findings is "*Logos* (Heraclitus, Fragment B 50)," in EGT. Heidegger's investigations of the Greek sense of *logos* are closely tied to his inquiry into other fundamental Greek words, including *phusis* and ALÊTHEIA. If *phusis* means entities' abiding emerging into presence, then *logos* can refer to the structure and sense of this EMERGENCE, which in turn calls for human thought as its recipient and preserver. *Logos*, in Heraclitus, thus refers both to the order of things and to human speech and thought. As emergence into presence, *phusis* also involves *alêtheia* or unconcealment. This primordial truth demands to be appreciated and articulated in human *logos*.

Heidegger's enemies have often taken his comments on logic as proof of the absurdity of his pseudo-philosophy. This all-too-easy dismissal assumes that any coherent philosophical position must consist of logically ordered assertions. But this assumption, in turn, rests on the view that assertions are the primary bearers of truth. By rethinking the relation between Dasein and unconcealment, Heidegger calls this view into question and provokes us to reconsider the nature of philosophy. His aim is not to discard logic, but to deepen it into an exploration of "the abysses of being" (GA38:10/8).

Richard Polt

FURTHER READING

Bucher 2006/2007, Dahlstrom 2001, Dastur 1987, Denker and Zaborowski 2006, Käufer 2005a, Käufer 2011, Kisiel 2002, chaps. 4 and 5, Mohanty 1988, Pöggeler 1989, Shirley 2010

LOOKING AT (*ANSCHAUEN*). SEE INTUITION.

M

129.
MACHINATION (*MACHENSCHAFT*)

MACHINATION IS THE manipulative power that comes to dominate the BEING of entities at the end of Western METAPHYSICS when all entities, including human beings, are thought of as makeable and malleable through planning, manipulation, and calculation so that everything is from the outset pre-directed toward produceability (GA66:16). The emergence of machination marks the shift from the modern perspective on entities as objects, which is associated with Descartes, to conceiving them as products of the will to power, as formulated by Nietzsche: "will to power is the highest form of machination" (GA47:324).

Heidegger deployed the word "machination" already in the context of his reading of Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit* from 1930–31 (GA32:46/32, 205/142, 209/145), but only in the conventional sense of the word as a kind of scheming (GA65:126). The more rigorous and unique sense of the term that he developed after 1937 highlighted the predominance of making (*machen*) within metaphysics going back to the Greek terms *poiêsis* and *techne* (GA65:126). Nevertheless, there is a tendency to want to refer making to the human being that does the making. Heidegger resisted this tendency as is clear from his attempts to distance his account of technology from that of Ernst Jünger. Even though Heidegger's choice of the term "machination" (*Machenschaft*) seems to be indebted to Jünger's account of total mobilization (*totale Mobilmachung*) (GA90:172–74, 202), Heidegger rejected Jünger's tendency to think of human beings – and not being itself – as the executors of machination (GA66:28). In addition to evoking a sense of making, the word *Machenschaft* also evokes echoes of POWER (*Macht*), but again this is not human power. In a manner that anticipates Michel Foucault, Heidegger insisted that we cannot take possession of power but can only be possessed by it (GA69:63). To approach human making in terms of machination is to be directed to the empowering of power and the malleability of all entities to which this empowering is directed in advance (GA69:186).

Although Heidegger held out the possibility that machination and the devastation (*Verwüstung*) that erupts from it might overwhelm human beings altogether (GA66:15), he also insisted that recognition of machination in terms of the HISTORY OF BEING could only be known from another INCEPTION (GA66:400). It thus serves as a transition to something other (GA69:47). This would later be reformulated, borrowing a phrase from Hölderlin, that where the danger is grows that which rescues (GA7:35–36/QCT 34–35). A corollary of this is that machination is not accessible to metaphysical thinking (GA66:26) and indeed that any attempt to arrive at the heart of machination using terms like dynamic, total, imperial, calculative, and planning is ultimately inadequate to the phenomenon because they are metaphysical terms.

Heidegger did not intend *machination* to be understood simply as a descriptive term corresponding to a LIVED EXPERIENCE (*Erlebnis*) of it. Indeed, experience in this sense belongs to machination (GA65:127) and is under its sway. Access to machination is only through the history of being to which it belongs. Although the word machination appears in passing in only a few of the works published by Heidegger in his lifetime, most notably his lectures on

Nietzsche from the late 1930s and early 1940s, it was only with the posthumous publication of Heidegger's unpublished manuscripts from the period from 1936 to 1942, in which he developed his account of the history of being, that it came to attract extensive scholarly interest. It is for this reason that it is not better understood even though it is arguably one of Heidegger's most important insights.

For Heidegger to think machination in terms of the history of being is to locate it at the consummation of Western metaphysics (GA69:44). "The essence of power as machination . . . is itself the end of metaphysics" (GA69:71). It is hidden in the extreme ABANDONMENT OF BEING that gives rise to machination (GA6.2:445/EP 80). Heidegger had long thought of Western metaphysics in terms of a tendency to approach entities as produced, but it was with the introduction of his account of the contemporary dominance of TECHNOLOGY that he arrived at his insight into the unity of metaphysics. This means that the extreme FORGETFULNESS OF BEING that is characteristic of the essence of technology was prepared for from the beginning of philosophy. Understanding this illuminates the otherwise puzzling claim that the principle of a program of racial breeding can be thought of as metaphysically necessary (GA6.2:278/N3 231). Eugenics as a thinking of human beings as just as malleable and makeable as things are arises from the dominance of machination understood as the claim that the essence of being is geared toward malleability. From the late 1930s Heidegger formulated his account of machination by frequent reference to total wars, world wars, and the struggle for world dominance, but in 1941 he insisted that the basic machinational form was the new order (*Neuordung*, GA71:101/ 85). This was a reference to the new European order announced by Hitler in his speech at the Berlin Sports Palace on January 20, 1941. Heidegger's account of machination was, of course, in no way intended to be confined to the Nazis, but however much one believes that Heidegger's thinking was compromised as a result of his own association with National Socialism, one should also recognize that the direction taken by his account of machination cannot be understood unless one sees it as a consequence of his close familiarity with National Socialism together with his extreme disillusionment with various aspects of it. But the most striking aspect of his account was his insistence that racial breeding, the annihilation of the human essence, thoughtlessness and so on, were not historical aberrations, but had been set in motion by Western philosophy from its beginning.

Robert Bernasconi

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA6.2:14–21/N3 175–82; GA65:107–12, 124–35, 407–09; GA66:15–29, 173–78; GA69:43–49, 179–98; GA76:286–307; GA96:5–7, 29–32, 32–34, 56–57

FURTHER READING

Dallmayr 2001, Elden 2006, 139–58, Ziarek 2002

MAN (MENSCH) SEE HUMAN.

MANIFESTATION (*ERSCHEINUNG*). SEE APPEARANCE.

MATERIAL (*SACHE*). SEE MATTER, THE.

130.
MATTER, THE (*SACHE*)

Heidegger uses the expression "the matter" (*die Sache*) to indicate what philosophy should be concerned with. In particular, the phrase "the matter of THINKING" (*die Sache des Denkens*) is shorthand for the object of philosophical thinking. Although Heidegger at times identifies certain topics in philosophy as its true matter, most notably BEING, these commitments are subject to repeated reconsideration.

This gives rise to a sustained interest in how philosophy may first of all decide what its subject-matter should be. The notion of "the matter" helps to formulate this question: "When we ask about the task of thinking, this means in the scope of philosophy: to determine that which concerns thinking, which is still controversial for thinking, which is the controversy. This is what the word 'matter' [*Sache*] means in the German language" (GA14:75/OTB 61). Heidegger's discussion of "the matter" thus serves as a non-committal way to describe what philosophy has concerned itself with in the past and how it should decide what to concern itself with in the future. Heidegger retrospectively describes the purpose of his philosophy not as solving a specific philosophical problem but as "*awakening an engagement with the question as to the matter of thinking*" (GA1:438).

Heidegger's concern for the matter of philosophy originates in Husserl's phenomenological slogan *To the things themselves!*, which in its German original reads *Zu den Sachen selbst!* This slogan has an essential negative function: instead of construing ever more complex theories distorting access to them, philosophy should impartially turn to its actual subject-matter. Husserl elaborates what the true objects of philosophy are (phenomena in CONSCIOUSNESS) and how they should be related to (they should be reflected upon and made the object of phenomenological description).

Already in his early writings, Heidegger takes issue with this interpretation of the phenomenological slogan. He cautions that "the most narrow-minded dogmatism *can* hide behind" Husserl's maxim (GA17:60/45). In Husserl, "the phenomenological principle 'To the matters themselves' has undergone a *quite definite interpretation*. [It] means 'to them insofar as they come into question as the theme of a science'" (GA17:274/211). Heidegger dismisses this scientist interpretation of the phenomenological slogan yet remains committed to its principle. Initially, his concern is not with the methodological nature of phenomenology, but with its specific matter: Heidegger's discussion of phenomenology in *Being and Time* §7 presents his central conjecture that being, not consciousness, is the actual subject-matter of phenomenological method.

Although *Being and Time* gives some argument to that effect (SZ 35–36), the true achievement of phenomenology as philosophical method qua return to the "things themselves" must lie in that it eventually becomes identical to its matter. At the end of *Basic Problems of Phenomenology*, Heidegger indeed claims that his foregoing discussion of ontological problems has been "unbiased enough" to have done only "what the things themselves demand" (GA24:467/328).

In this line of thought, the methodological determination of the matter of philosophy can only be confirmed by successful access to it. Consequently, to the extent that Heidegger after *Being and Time* and the TURN criticizes his attempt to determine the meaning of being, he also calls into question the claim that being is the principal matter in philosophy. Some later texts confirm this view, for example the letter to William Richardson, where being is said to remain the "first and last thing itself for thought" (GA11:148/HR 300). But already in *Being and Time*, Heidegger had also taken unconcealment (*Unverborgenheit*, *alêtheia*) as referring to "'the things themselves,' that which shows itself, *entities in the how of their discoveredness*" (SZ 219). Later Heidegger endorses the CLEARING (*Lichtung*) as the "eminent matter of another thinking" (GA16:631/ QDMT 221).

Thus Heidegger is not unequivocally committed to his initial ontological reinterpretation of Husserl's principle in *Being and Time* §7. What the matter of thinking should be, rather becomes a philosophical question of its own, a question as yet undecided. Consequentially, Heidegger dismisses relying on method to determine the matter of philosophy. In the late lecture "The End of Philosophy and the Task of Thinking," Heidegger criticizes Hegel and Husserl in this vein: both presuppose a method of philosophy and then identify it with its matter (as one could argue early Heidegger also does); therefore neither provides an argument for why "thought" (Hegel) or "consciousness" (Husserl) should be matters of philosophy.

Heidegger then explicitly addresses the open question what the matter of thinking should be. Although he recognizes being, or "the presence of what is present" (GA14:82/OTB 66), as the matter of philosophy, he also discusses the clearing (*Lichtung*) as the condition of possibility for any subject-matter of philosophy. Heidegger consequently describes the task of thinking not simply as concern with its given matter but as "determination of the matter of thinking" (GA14:90/OTB 73). "The demand on thought to return 'to the things themselves' has meaning and a reliable hold only when it is asked, first of all, what the matter of thinking is and from where it is given its determination" (GA16:632/QDMT 222).

Tobias Keiling

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Matter and phenomenology GA14:54/OTB 45; Heidegger 1995
Determination of the matter of thinking GA16:620–33/QDMT 213–23

FURTHER READING

Crowell 2013, 58–78, Figal 2010b, Held 1992, Sallis 1995

MEANING (*SINN*). SEE SENSE.

131.
MEANING (*BEDEUTUNG*)

"MEANING" REFERS TO a distinct or delimited signification that is capable of being marked by a linguistic or non-linguistic expression. Such meaning involves particular entities or features being picked out in some way against a less determinate background of SENSE that is basic to Dasein's understanding of the world.

Bedeutung – the word translated here as "meaning" – is a common word in German, and Heidegger uses it frequently in standard ways both to refer to the meaning of a word and to highlight that something is of relevance or importance (*von Bedeutung*). The former is close to his own more technical use of the term to mark – as it is called in the following – delimited meaning. Heidegger also routinely refers to a particular meaning of a word as its sense (*Sinn*), another common term that German-speaking philosophers – most famously, Frege – have sometimes contrasted with *Bedeutung*. For Heidegger these terms differ in nuance (see below) but are not completely distinct. As he puts it, delimited "meanings" (*Bedeutungen*) are always "sense-like" (*sinnhaft*, SZ 161).

Meaning (*Bedeutung*) is one of several terms Heidegger uses in *Being and Time* to describe features of the transformation of indeterminate background meaning or sense (*Sinn*) into distinct or delimited meanings capable of being marked by an expression. Heidegger specifically thematizes meaning(s) only briefly in connection with his discussion of discourse and language in §34. There he defines "meanings" tersely as "the articulated of what is articulable" (*das Artikulierte des Artikulierbaren*, SZ 161). By "what is articulable" he means the kind of meaning – which Heidegger calls sense (*Sinn*) – that is inherent in DASEIN's background awareness of the WORLD as a whole. As Heidegger conceives it, this background sense has a certain structure or form, but is yet to be broken down into constituent parts. As "the articulated," meanings are arrived at by ARTICULATION, the process of imposing order by developing and dividing up that overall background sense of the world. This articulation process encompasses what Heidegger calls DISCOURSE (*Rede*) and INTERPRETATION (*Auslegung*), finally resulting in "articulated" meanings that can be marked by words. In this process, as Heidegger describes it, the "whole of meaning" is broken down or "dissolved" into meanings, words "grow onto meanings" (SZ 161).

This conception of meanings has several important features. First, the way Heidegger describes the articulation of meanings here does not identify any essential role for word use, and hence for language (*Sprache*) as Heidegger defines it (SZ 161). Rather, the use of words is to presuppose meaning formation, which Heidegger characterizes in terms of the structurally prior notions of discourse and interpretation (see also GA20:360). Part of Heidegger's point in making this claim is to highlight, second, that the articulation of meanings is a movement from whole to part, from overall sense through to delimited word meanings (GA24:297). The result is a kind of structure in which parts are intrinsically defined by the whole to which they belong – in Heidegger's terms an articulated or jointed structure (see JOINTEDNESS) – rather than one in which independent or atomic parts are arranged to build up a whole. That is why to describe the "whole of meaning" (*Bedeutungsganze*) in terms of meanings is to "dissolve" the former. So

although the "articulation into meanings" yields a set of concepts (*eine Begrifflichkeit*, SZ 157), the latter are for Heidegger properly understood as the expression of "jointed complexes of meaning" (*gegliederte Bedeutungszusammenhänge*, SZ 168), as simultaneously expressing both "highlighted meanings and complexes of meaning" (GA20:370). Closely linked with this is a third feature, that of meaning holism. As signalled by his talk of a "whole of meaning," delimited meanings are for Heidegger grounded in the complete nexus of meaning relations (*Bezugsganze des Bedeutens*) that make up the "meaningfulness" (*Bedeutsamkeit*) of the lived world (SZ 87).

Against this background several distinctive features of Heidegger's conception of (delimited) meanings can be seen. First, it is possible to see how Heidegger's notions of sense and meaning are both closely linked and differ in nuance. A delimited meaning remains "sense-like" because it is immersed in the context or horizon of overall sense, with the latter forming a condition of possibility for the former, as an indeterminate background against which particular features can be determined. Thus, as Heidegger conceives them, sense and meaning do not – as they do with Frege – contrast as distinct semantic properties, but are closely linked aspects of an expression's meaningful constitution. Second, as Heidegger conceives it, "word meaning" is not separate from the meaning of "things themselves" (*die Sachen selbst*, SZ 94; see MATTER). To grasp the meaning of a word is to understand how a piece of the world is itself carved out, rather than merely how part of our language or of our "subjective" minds is picked out (GA21:146).

The thought that delimited meanings are holistically grounded in the world's meaningfulness is central to Heidegger's distinctive opposition to a number of influential philosophical approaches to meaning. To begin with, it underlies his claim that the meaning of signs cannot be understood as a system of formal relations. Heidegger suggests that semantic or syntactic relations can be "easily formalized" but that to do this is uninformative, and argues that a "theory of meaning" (*Bedeutungslehre*) needs to be seen as "rooted in the ontology of Dasein" (SZ 78, 166). His point is that such theories are superficial and that the meaning of signs must be understood non-reductively in terms of their embedding and function in the practices, situations, and phenomena of human life. Although Heidegger hints that the target of these comments is Husserl's analysis of meaning in the *Logical Investigations* (SZ 77n., 166n.), they are clearly broader in scope. They apply equally, for example, to any attempt to understand linguistic meaning either by developing a formal semantics based on the use of predicate calculus, or in terms of those features of the world that words stand for (their reference or extension). Parallel considerations underlie Heidegger's rejection of the idea that delimited (or articulated) meaning is to be understood in terms of propositional content or the contributions that specific terms make to such content. Thus he rejects the "meaning categories" identified by logic centering on propositional ASSERTIONS (*Aussagen*, SZ 165) as a model, and often argues that the function of propositions must be seen as embedded in his own broader conception of meaning and meaningfulness (e.g., SZ §33, 44; GA21:127–61).

In describing the connections between meaning and meaningfulness in *Being and Time*, Heidegger uses the word *be-deuten* – with a non-standard hyphen – to generate a complex linguistic resonance that cannot be reproduced in English. His hyphenated term contrasts with the standard verb *bedeuten* (to mean, stand for, or imply) and highlights the stem verb *deuten* (to interpret, or point). As Heidegger explains in a parallel passage in his 1925/26 lectures, when an entity is understood in terms of its practical utility it is "*be-deutet*" in that "it is already placed in an interpretation [*in eine Deutung gestellt*]" (GA21:144). Such

interpretation is to shape the relation between the interpreter and what's interpreted (GA21:148f.). On the one hand, it allows Dasein to establish its own significance (*Dasein "bedeutet" ihm selbst*, SZ 87). On the other hand, its "*Be-deuten*" establishes the basic structure of REFERENCES or assignments (*Verweisungen*), such as the connection between tools and their uses, that for Heidegger make up the instrumental world (SZ 87). The directedness and interconnectedness of such assignments is due to their being given the capacity to "point," as alluded to by the underlying verb *deuten*. Heidegger's terminology thus immediately highlights the intimate connections between the world's meaningfulness (*Bedeutsamkeit*) and a meaning-generating process (*das Bedeuten*) that is simultaneously an interpretive activity by Dasein (its *Be-deuten*), and in which both Dasein's own sense of self and the directedness of instrumental assignments are grounded.

   In fact, these resonances are less salient and less central than they might have been. For they rely in part on the fact that shortly before completing *Being and Time* Heidegger was experimenting with the term *Bedeuten* to label the interpretive activity that introduces an AS-STRUCTURE (GA21:149, 152f.). However, in the work itself the term "interpretation" (*Auslegung*) is used to label this activity, perhaps reflecting an intention to mark more clearly his distance from traditional theories of "meaning."

<div align="right">*Andrew Inkpin*</div>

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 77–78, 87, 161, 165–66, 349; GA20:360, 370; GA21:135–53, esp. 144; GA24:297

FURTHER READING

Carman 2003, 222–26, Dreyfus 1991, 208, 215–24, Wrathall 2011, esp. 130–31, Wrathall 2013a, 201–22, esp. 202–05

<div align="center">

MEDITATION (*BESINNUNG*). SEE REFLECTION.

MERE TALK (*GEREDE*). SEE IDLE TALK.

MERELY THERE (*VORHANDEN*). SEE OCCURRENT.

</div>

132.
METAPHYSICS (*METAPHYSIK*)

"Metaphysics" can refer to:

1. A division of academic philosophy that inquires into BEING and the first principles of entities. Metaphysics, understood in this way, exists alongside other branches of academic philosophy, such as epistemology, ethics, aesthetics, etc. (see GA29/30:35).

2. The human capacity that makes it possible to engage in metaphysics in sense (1) – namely, the capacity to "go out beyond" (*hinausgehen über*) or transcend entities so that, no longer being driven to respond to what is immediately present, we are able to see ourselves and other entities in terms of possible ways to be.

3. The sequence of different universal and all-encompassing ways of understanding and relating to entities "as such and as a whole." Each historical EPOCH is one such way of understanding and relating to entities, examples being "the metaphysics of will to power" (which characterizes the technological age; see, e.g., GA52:91 and TECHNOLOGY) or "the metaphysics of subjectivity" (which characterizes the modern age; see, e.g., GA48:259 and MODERNITY).

4. A way of thinking that grows out of and expresses or represents a metaphysic in the third sense. Philosophers like Plato, Aquinas, Descartes, Leibniz, Kant, Hegel, and Nietzsche, are all examples of thinkers whose works (whether metaphysical in the first sense or not) express in the clearest way possible a metaphysic in the third sense. They are thus "metaphysical thinkers" – even when, as in Nietzsche's case, their work is explicitly opposed to metaphysics in the first sense (see, e.g., GA77:188), or when they are writing about a different division of academic philosophy (see, e.g., GA6.2:104/N4 78; GA55:252).

Heidegger understands metaphysics in the fourth sense as a philosophical expression that manifests and "preserves in words" a metaphysic in the third sense. We can have a metaphysic in the third sense – a particular position within or understanding of the being of entities – because of metaphysics in the second sense – because we are beings who transcend entities (see TRANSCENDENCE). Metaphysics in the first, third, and fourth senses are motivated by the ANXIETY we experience when, in virtue of our human capacity to transcend (i.e., metaphysics in the second sense), we discover the contingency and arbitrariness (i.e., the nothingness) of everything that is. Metaphysical beings recoil from contingency, and driven by anxiety set out to develop a metaphysic in the third sense – a particular stance for relating to everything in advance, a stance that secures the WORLD for us by pervading all our activities, and by determining the ground in accordance with which entities as such and as a whole can show up (see GA9:104/83). Anxiety also drives human beings to come up with an explanation of the principles and structures of being (that is, anxiety motivates metaphysics in the first sense).

A metaphysic in the third sense need not be explicitly grasped; it can be embodied in the organized contexts of equipment, activities, social roles, and purposive ends that characterize a given age. A particular metaphysical epoch is one such unified way or style of making sense of entities – whether or not it is expressly grasped as such. In his later works, Heidegger argues that Western civilizations since the Greeks have been metaphysical in the third sense – each has had its own, universal way of understanding how entities as a whole hang together coherently, and of understanding entities as such (i.e., of understanding that in virtue of which an entity counts as an entity).

Let's consider each of these four senses of "metaphysics" in some more detail.

1   METAPHYSICS AS A DIVISION OF ACADEMIC PHILOSOPHY

In his earliest work up until the publication of *Being and Time*, Heidegger used "metaphysics" exclusively in the first sense – that is, to refer to that part of philosophy which offers a "science of principles" (GA1:201), or "knowledge of the suprasensory" (GA28:28). For the early Heidegger, metaphysics is first philosophy (GA23:9), and conversely "every philosophy is metaphysics when, in accordance with its innermost tendency, it comes to its most uninhibited consequences" (GA56/57:8).[1] Because Heidegger's primary interest in his early works is ONTOLOGY, he at times describes his own work as unproblematically metaphysical – indeed, he often uses the terms "metaphysics" and "ontology" interchangeably: "metaphysics in the scientific sense = ontology, and is used here in this sense only" (GA23:7; see also GA24:38; GA25:243; GA63:3). He also discusses a plurality of different metaphysics, meaning the different doctrines of thinkers concerned with ontology – for instance, Aristotelian metaphysics, Kantian metaphysics (GA3), Leibnizian metaphysics (GA26), the metaphysics of German Idealism (GA28), etc.

In his 1935/36 lecture course, published as *What is a Thing?*, Heidegger explains why he used "metaphysics" as a synonym for philosophy tout court:

> the term "metaphysics" here should indicate only that the questions dealt with stand at the core and center of philosophy. By contrast, we do not mean with "metaphysics" a special field or branch within philosophy in contrast to logic and ethics. There are no fields in philosophy because philosophy itself is not a field. Something like a division of labor is senseless in philosophy. . . . We therefore want to keep the term "metaphysics" as free as possible from all that historically adheres to it. For us it signifies only that procedure during which one runs the danger of falling into a well. (GA41:3)

The last line, of course, refers to Thales who, according to legend, fell into a well while looking up at the heavens. Similarly, philosophy is metaphysical to the degree that it looks past the closest things to the unconditioned, transcendent realm (see GA41:8).

Heidegger criticizes traditional academic schools of metaphysics for their methodological orientation to logic, reason, and epistemology (see, e.g., GA3:167ff.), and the ensuing tendency to focus on *entities* at the expense of an inquiry into *being itself*. But rather than rejecting

---

[1] See also GA24:23: "the scientific concept of metaphysics is identical with the concept of philosophy in general: a critically transcendental science of being, that is, ontology."

metaphysics out of hand, the early Heidegger argues for the need to ground metaphysics in general on the foundation of a metaphysics of DASEIN (see, e.g., GA28:41ff.). Dasein's ontology will sustain a fundamental ontology because Dasein is a temporal BEING-IN-THE-WORLD, and thus the entity with an understanding of being. For Heideggerian metaphysics in the first sense, the fundamental questions of metaphysics are centered on TEMPORALITY and the nature of the WORLD, because he argues that an inquiry into worldhood and TIME are the indispensable means for arriving at an understanding of the SENSE of being. This line of argument eventually leads to Heidegger's interest in metaphysics in the second sense – metaphysics as the "fundamental occurrence in Dasein," namely, our becoming the beings we are by transcending entities toward being (GA29/30:12). "The human being is the entity that lets the irruption into entities happen in such a way that entities are manifest in 'themselves,'" Heidegger explains, and that means that "the most radical and broadest question of metaphysics is originally and comprehensively in agreement with the task of a metaphysics of Dasein" (GA28:236).

2   METAPHYSICS AS THE HUMAN CAPACITY FOR TRANSCENDENCE

Shortly after completing *Being and Time*, Heidegger began to argue for the thesis that human beings are essentially concerned with metaphysical questions: "metaphysics belongs to the nature of the human being. And for that reason, the human Dasein by its very nature has a predilection for metaphysics. We could also say: all existing is already a philosophizing" (GA26:274; see also GA26:197, 249; GA3:144). The "metaphysical predilection" of human beings gives rise to a need to disambiguate between two senses of the phrase "the metaphysics of Dasein" – a phrase, Heidegger notes, which is "ambiguous in a positive sense." He explains:

> the metaphysics of Dasein is not just a metaphysics about Dasein, but rather it is the metaphysics that necessarily takes place *as Dasein*. But that implies that metaphysics can never become a metaphysics "about" Dasein in the same way that Zoology is about animals. (GA3:231)

The discipline of zoology doesn't depend on the animals it studies having an interest in or understanding of zoology. But "the fate of metaphysics remains bound to the concealed occurrence of metaphysics in the Dasein itself" (GA3:231). "Insofar as we exist," Heidegger maintains, "we are always already within it [i.e., metaphysics]" (GA9:122/96).

The distinctive feature of the human being is that "its essence … is in itself metaphysical" (GA7:71/EP 87). Heidegger's most sustained account of metaphysics as the human essence or nature is offered in his inaugural lecture at Freiburg University in 1929, "What is Metaphysics?" In order to begin "unfolding" the "metaphysical inquiry," Heidegger sketches out the contemporary, scientific understanding of entities as a whole. We inhabit a scientific understanding when (a) the "relation to the world that pervades all the sciences" is one in which entities are primarily understood in terms of their causal grounds (GA9:104/82); (b) we take up a "freely chosen stance" of impartiality or objectivity (*Sachlichkeit*; GA9:104/82); and (c) in the pursuit of the sciences, human beings "irrupt … into the whole of entities, indeed, in such a way that in and through this irruption [*Einbruch*] the entities break out [*aufbricht*] into what and how they are"

(GA9:105/83). While it is "impossible in principle" to "comprehend the whole of entities," Heidegger argues, we nonetheless "constantly" (*ständig*) "find ourselves in the midst of entities as a whole" (GA9:110/87). "No matter how fragmented everyday life might appear to be," Heidegger insists, still we "always maintain entities in a unity of the 'whole,' if only in a shadowy way" (GA9:110/87). Our hold on the WHOLE is experienced in MOODS like boredom, when the world as a whole shows up as a waste of time, or in love, when the world as a whole is experienced with joy (see GA9:110/87). But we also have a countervailing experience – not an experience of the unity of all entities, but rather an experience of the essential meaninglessness of entities, of their lacking any intrinsic significance or purpose (see GA9:111/88). Entities escape from our efforts to comprehend them, to fix their true essence: "we can get no hold on things. In the slipping away of entities, this inability alone remains and comes over us" (GA9:112/88). Heidegger now locates metaphysics in our openness to the NOTHING – to the essential lack of determinateness of entities: "holding itself out into the nothing, Dasein is in each case already beyond entities as a whole" (GA9:115/91). To recognize the nothing is to be "beyond being" – *meta ta phusika*: "metaphysics is inquiry beyond or over entities that aims to recover them as such and as a whole for our grasp" (GA9:118/93). Metaphysics in the first sense – a discipline that aims to grasp and comprehend entities as such and as a whole – is thus born out of our anxiety at our essentially metaphysical nature, in virtue of which we are always beyond entities and open to the nothing:

> Human Dasein can comport itself toward entities only if it holds itself out into the nothing. Going beyond entities occurs in the essence of Dasein. But this going beyond is metaphysics itself. This implies that metaphysics belongs to the "nature of the human being." It is neither a division of academic philosophy nor a field of arbitrary thoughts. Metaphysics is the fundamental occurrence in Dasein. It is that Dasein itself. (GA9:121–22/96)

In this passage, then, metaphysics is redefined to refer directly to the happening of Dasein, which happening gives rise to metaphysics in the first sense (i.e., metaphysics understood as the philosophical quest for an understanding of being as the ground of entities):[2] "philosophy only gets under way through a peculiar insertion of our own existence into the basic possibilities of Dasein as a whole. For this insertion it is decisive, first, that we give space for entities as a whole" (GA9:122/96).

   Later, Heidegger changed his mind on the issue of whether we are essentially metaphysical beings, because he came to believe that the very act of striving for a grasp of the whole contributes to an oblivion of the clearing of being. "Da-sein," the later Heidegger maintains, could not fully realize its proper essence within a metaphysical configuration of being. "Thus," he concludes, "it is impossible to speak of a 'metaphysics of Dasein'" (GA66:386). That is, it is not the striving for a comprehension of entities as a whole which is essential to our being, but our "standing in the CLEARING" (see GA9:323–24/247) – a stand that *might* involve an understanding of entities as a whole and as such, but might also involve a post-metaphysical form of DWELLING (see also the FOURFOLD). But to fully appreciate this point, we have to say more about metaphysics in the third sense.

---

[2] This seems to be another example of Heidegger's use of the principle *a potiori fit denominatio*.

3   METAPHYSICS AS THE TRUTH OF ENTITIES AS SUCH AS A WHOLE

As Heidegger developed a historical account of being, he came to think of metaphysics as historical in a dual sense. First, metaphysics is itself one specific way of experiencing entities in the course of human history – before and after the "epoch of metaphysics" there have been and will be non-metaphysical ways of disclosing being: "metaphysics is an epoch of the history of being itself" (GA5:265/198; see also GA65:128; GA66:250; and HISTORY OF BEING). Second, within the epoch of metaphysics – which is coextensive with the development of Western philosophy from Plato to Nietzsche and up until the present (GA87:175) – there has been a historical sequence of different metaphysics – different ways of disclosing entities (i.e., different forms of "the TRUTH of entities as such and as a whole"). "Each age of Western history," Heidegger argues, "is grounded in its particular, prevailing metaphysic" (GA6.1:430/ N3 7). The later Heidegger's preoccupation with metaphysics is first and foremost an attempt to understand this history of metaphysics – the history of different disclosures of being:

> Metaphysics as an academic discipline has a history – a sequence of distinct approaches to questions of ontology – *because* being itself discloses itself differently in different ages.
>
> In metaphysics reflection is accomplished concerning the essence of entities and a decision takes place regarding the essence of truth. Metaphysics grounds an age, in that through a specific interpretation of entities and through a specific comprehension of truth it gives to that age the ground of its essential character (*Wesensgestalt*). This ground dominates through and through all the phenomena that distinguish the age. (GA5:75/57)

Heidegger is thus not interested in arguing about the correctness of particular metaphysical doctrines, or in showing how various doctrines can be assimilated to one another. Instead, he wants to gain insight into the underlying understanding of being that generates the rich variety of metaphysical doctrines, and for this he looks at the broader sweep of historical changes in the style and subject-matter of metaphysical thought (see GA65:175).

Heidegger insists that a metaphysic "in the strict sense . . . is never understood as a particular doctrinal view, or as a philosophical 'discipline,' or as a form of knowledge or the like. Rather, metaphysics is thought as the fitting of entities as a whole to entities as such" (GA66:382). In his later work, Heidegger holds that entities are disclosed in their being when we grasp their FITTINGNESS (i.e., the conditions under which they are connected, adapted, and adjusted to each other). Thus, metaphysics "in the strict sense" is the process or condition under which entities are constituted as what they are. "To be sure," he concedes, "one must often speak superficially, in such a way that 'metaphysics' comes into the field of view as a doctrine. But this 'metaphysics' is merely a consequence and degeneration of metaphysics" in the strict or proper sense (GA66:382). Or, as he explains elsewhere, a metaphysic

> is not only not a "personal system" but also not a "system" at all in the sense of a thought-structure laid down in books. A metaphysic is the truth about entities as a whole, in which truth each age must stand in one way or another in order to be an historical age. (GA90:50)

A metaphysic prevails in an age quite independently of whether it is ever given adequate expression in a philosophical work:

> The structure of the truth "about" beings as a whole that prevails at a time is called "metaphysics." It makes no difference whether or not this metaphysics is given expression in propositions, whether or not the expressions are formed into an explicit system. Metaphysics is that knowledge wherein Western historical humanity preserves the truth of its relations to beings as a whole and the truth about those beings themselves. (GA9:241/185)

As is generally the case in Heidegger's work, *knowledge* is best thought of as a kind of "know-how" – human beings "know" what being is at any given time, because they know how to comport themselves in relation to entities. Thus, an age could be thoroughly metaphysical without understanding itself as such. As a case in point, Heidegger was profoundly critical of the logical positivist claim to be able to overcome metaphysics through logical analysis (see Carnap 1931) – first of all, because such a claim treated metaphysics as a philosophical discipline rather than a way in which entities show up, and second because the claim implies that we could change our fundamental understanding of entities merely by avoiding certain linguistic forms of expression. Heidegger saw the very fact that logical positivism might make such a claim as a symptom of the profound hold that the current (positivist) understanding of being has on our age:

> "Positivism" represents the crudest of all "metaphysical" modes of thinking, insofar as on the one hand it contains a wholly determinate decision about the beingness of entities (sensibleness), and on the other hand it constantly transcends this way of being (*Seiende*) through the fundamental establishment of a uniform "causality." (GA65:172; see also GA66:24–25; GA40:228)

In "Age of the World Picture," Heidegger identifies four "essential moments" of a metaphysic – that means, four key aspects of the understanding of being (aspects which are subject to change in the course of the history of the West). These include: (1) what it is to be human, including the "essential character of selfhood," (2) "the interpretation of the essence of the being of entities," (3) "the projection of the essence of truth," and (4) the sense in which the human being is the "measure" (GA5:104/79).

    With regard to the second moment, Heidegger argues that every time a metaphysical thinker arrives at an explicit interpretation of being, he or she proceeds in a similar way. Metaphysicians take as given the way entities now show up, and infer a general and universal account of being from the current mode of UNCONCEALMENT of entities:

> All metaphysics asks about the being of entities, while thinking back from entities to their being and from this being to entities. Entities are as entities already decided in their essence, and are always the criterion for the determination of being. That decision is as such neither experienced nor questioned. . . . In the light of being, metaphysics executes an interpretation that is in each case differently oriented and an explanation of the in-each-case differently experienced entities as a whole. (GA90:279–80)

Heidegger's name for this being, when it is understood as the most general concept or category that applies to all currently prevailing beings, is "beingness" (*Seiendheit*). "In the entire history of metaphysics," he explains, "'being' is always grasped as the beingness of entities" (GA65:266).

Metaphysicians also tend to treat being as if it were itself an entity, because they expect being to function as that which causes or grounds entities (see GA66:388). The result is that all metaphysics ends up being an ONTO-THEO-LOGY – it explains entities (*ontos*) by appealing to a highest being (*theos*) (see "The Onto-theo-logical Constitution of Metaphysics," GA11/ID; see also GA68:81). "Metaphysics," Heidegger explains, "either derives being from a supreme being, or it makes being the product of entities and their mere representation, or it combines both explanations of being in terms of entities" (GA66:91). When its focus is that of understanding being as derived from entities, metaphysics grasps entities *as such*. When its focus is on understanding the highest source and thus unifier of all entities, it grasps entities *as a whole*:

> Metaphysics thinks entities as such, that is, in general. Metaphysics thinks entities as such, that is, as a whole. Metaphysics thinks the being of entities both in the grounding unity of what is most general, that is, the indifferently valid everywhere, and also in the founding unity of all-ness, that is, the highest of all. The being of entities is thus thought of in advance as the grounding ground. (GA11:66/ID 57)

Because of its onto-theo-logical character, Heidegger charges that metaphysics confuses two distinct kinds of inquiry into entities, and ends up distorting both philosophy and theology.

When it comes to the third moment outlined above – the metaphysical projection of truth – Heidegger identifies a network of common background assumptions that shapes the way metaphysicians think about the truth of entities (see Wrathall 2011, 212–41). I will refer to these background assumptions as "theses," although they are rarely if ever formulated as such. They include:

1. *The Stability Thesis*: what entities truly are is found in that about them which is stable across changes.
2. *The Independence Thesis*: what entities truly are is independent of the particular thoughts, practices, and attitudes we have regarding them.
3. *The Uniformity Thesis*: all true entities share a single, uniform characteristic style.
4. *The Conformity Thesis*: there is a way entities are independently of our attitudes, and our attitudes are true by conforming to them.
5. *The Adjustment Thesis*: the truth of entities is only accessible when we have adjusted our attitudes so as properly to orient ourselves to reality.
6. *The Cognitivist Thesis*: the best attitude for grasping what things truly are is some species of cognitive attitude.

Heidegger poses a number of objections to these background metaphysical theses. For one thing, they privilege presence over absence, and persistence and stability over transience and volatility: "in all metaphysics since the inception of Western thought, being means presence; being, if it is in the highest instance to be thought, must be thought as pure presence, that is, as the present presence, as the abiding present, as the constantly standing 'now'" (GA8:40–41/ 38–39; see also GA14:76; and PRESENCING). Moreover, because they take for granted the current, presently enduring manifestation of entities, these background assumptions blind us to the conditions under which a particular understanding of being can come to prevail in the first place (see BEYNG). A post-metaphysical thinking will recognize the mutual dependence of entities and our "attitudes" toward those entities.

Much of Heidegger's later philosophy is preoccupied with the task of "overcoming metaphysics." This overcoming consists in learning to recognize the "epoch of metaphysics" as "one self-contained epoch of the history of beyng" (GA90:281). That, in turn, involves learning to recognize "the questionableness of the manifestation of being" (GA40:91/90). The step beyond metaphysics is to think about what gives being (see GA14:6; and History of Being).

4 METAPHYSICS AS THE DOCTRINE OF A GREAT THINKER

Although "metaphysics" in the strict sense is the decision about what entities are – a decision that prevails in a certain age, before giving way to a new decision – Heidegger also uses the word to refer to the work of those thinkers who most clearly articulate the understanding of being that prevails in their respective epochs. The philosophical doctrines of the great thinkers are "not metaphysics itself, but rather the derivative mode of its communication" (GA48:208). In a less strict or rigorous sense, then, Heidegger will say things like: "metaphysics is the truth of entities as such as a whole, ordained in words of thinkers" (GA48:66). Heidegger thus comes back around to using "metaphysics" to refer to the "opinion and judgment of a person" or "the doctrinal system and expression of an age" – but only when qualified by the insistence that metaphysics in this (fourth) sense is "the aftereffect and veneer" of metaphysics in the most important (i.e., third) sense:

> If therefore metaphysics, which belongs to the history of being itself, is identified with the name of a thinker (as with Plato's metaphysics or Kant's metaphysics), this is not to say that metaphysics is in each case the accomplishment and property or even the personal distinction of these thinkers as personalities engaged in a cultural activity. The designation means that these thinkers are what they are insofar as the truth of being has been entrusted to them in such a way that they say being, that is, say the being of entities within metaphysics. (GA6.2:232/N3 188)

It is precisely because metaphysics is operating in the background, at the most fundamental level, that "there must be thinkers," individuals "preeminently situated within the unconcealedness of being" (GA6.2:299/N3 249) and thus capable of articulating it for us:

> Each thinker has at any given time his fundamental philosophical position within metaphysics. Therefore a particular metaphysic can be called by his name. However, according to what is here thought as the essence of metaphysics, that does not mean in any way that a particular metaphysic is the achievement and possession of the thinker as a personality within the public sphere of creative cultural activity. (GA5:209–10/157–58)

Mark A. Wrathall

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA1:276, 415/BH 61; GA3:1ff., 167ff., 203ff., 230ff., 271ff., 294; GA5:98–100/74–76, 112–13/85, 209–11/157–59, 217/162–63; GA7:69–98/EP 84–110; GA9:236–37/181, 303–04/231–32, 310ff./ 235ff., 321–22/245–46, 331–32/252–53, 335–36/255, 365ff./277ff., 416–18/314–16, 420/317; GA11:60–61, 64ff./ID 51–52, 55ff.; GA14:24, 43–44, 60–61, 65, 67; GA15:310, 346/FS 24–25, 48;

GA17:238; GA19:447; GA21:117, 306, 312; GA22:68, 206; GA23:7, 9, 105, 198ff., 205, 213; GA24:23, 38, 114, 195; GA25:10ff., 52, 59ff.; GA26:32, 70, 125ff., 171, 174–75, 191, 199ff., 223–24, 229, 274; GA27:245ff.; GA28:21ff., 40ff., 235ff., 337; GA29/30:2ff., 10, 35, 59ff., 85–86, 253–54, 418ff.; GA40:19–22/18–21, 45–47/44–46, 91–92/90–91, 219/227–30; GA41:3, 98, 109–11; GA42:181; GA43:84, 283, 288; GA44:205–08, 212, 220–21, 226; GA46:176–77, 202ff.; GA50:128; GA53:21; GA55:257–58; GA56/57:8–9, 27, 137; GA58:21; GA59:189; GA60:24ff.; GA63:3; GA65:3, 12, 59, 128, 170–75, 182–83, 218, 247, 266, 297, 423–24, 426–29, 431–36, 465–67, 476–77, 497, 504–05; GA66:24–25, 86, 89–93, 173, 176, 218, 261ff., 275, 296, 343–45, 355ff., 362ff., 371–76, 382–403; GA67 *passim*; GA68:55, 81, 97–98; GA69:36ff.; GA70:20, 53, 77–78, 101–02; GA75:165; GA87:95, 175–76; GA90:50–51, 74, 253, 279–81

FURTHER READING

Thomson 2005, 7–43

MIND (*GEIST*). SEE SPIRIT.

MINDFULNESS (*BESINNUNG*). SEE REFLECTION.

133.
MINENESS (*JEMEINIGKEIT*)

MINENESS IS A condition of having a particularized, unique temporal-historical character. Mineness is, for Heidegger, related to "awhileness" or temporal particularity – *Jeweiligkeit*, Heidegger's coined abstraction of *jeweilig*, which adjectivally refers to a particular time, as in "*der jeweilige Präsident*" = "the president at the time." The abstraction first arises in one of Heidegger's Aristotle seminars in early 1923, in the context of Aristotle's reflections on the necessity of a phronetic insight into a particular situation of action, in order to decide what is to be done here and now, at this particular time. Awhileness then recurs in varying frequency in Heidegger's courses of 1923–24 in order to designate DASEIN, our very own Da-sein, in its most fundamental trait, in SS 1923 (GA63:7/5, 29/24, 48/38, 85/65, 95/73, 105/81), in WS 1923–24 (GA17:250/193, 289/221), in SS 1924 (GA18:32/24, 35/25, 180/122, 246/165, 350/239). Dasein means "*in each case* 'this' Dasein in its being-there *for a while at this particular time*" (GA63:7/5). "The being-there of our own Dasein is what it is precisely and only in its *temporally particular* 'there,' its being '*there*' *for a while*" (GA63:29/24). "There for a while at its particular time, Dasein is there in the awhileness of temporal particularity" (GA63:48/38). "The being-there of Dasein is what it is in the awhileness of temporal particularity" (GA63:85/65). In the above, *Jeweiligkeit* is translated as both "awhileness" and "temporal particularity." It testifies to the fact that Da-sein as being-t/here is inherently a historically situated existence that is allotted its while of time that is particularized by its unique temporal-historical characters.

In *Being and Time*, *Je-weil-igkeit*, "to each its while"(ness), is by and large displaced by *Je-mein-igkeit*, "in each case mine"(ness). Its introduction here is worthy of a more detailed citation: "That be-ing which is an *issue* for this entity in its very be-ing, is in each case mine. Thus Dasein is never to be taken ontologically as an instance or special case of a genus of entities as things that are extant and on hand. . . . Because Dasein has *in each case mineness* [*Jemeinigkeit*], one must always use a *personal* pronoun when one addresses it: 'I am,' 'you are'" (SZ 42). The details of this citation beg two remarks essential to the contextualization of Dasein.

(1) In the political thirties, Heidegger expands his personal pronouns to include the personal plural "we are," such that he eventually supplements "mineness" (*Je-meinigkeit*) with "yours-ness" (*Je-deinigkeit*) and "ours-ness" (*Je-unsrigkeit*). Going even further, in order to highlight the proper experience of ownness essential to being a Dasein, he transposes the personal indexicals of I, you, we, into their more intensive "reflexives," I my*self*, you your*self*, we our*selves*. For it is in transcending to the ownness and properness of the self in the properizing event that the I, you, and we come together and in each instantiation become them*selves*, in a "selfhood [that] is more originary than any I and you and we" (GA65:320).

(2) In dealing with a Dasein that is in *each* case mine, yours, ours, that therefore articulates itself according to eachness, genera and general universals simply will not do. Dasein's concepts are not generic and common, applicable to *all* indiscriminately and uniformly, but rather hermeneutically distributive and proper, applicable to *each* individually in accord with the unique temporal context in which each individual is situated. The same point is made in *Being*

and Time in the distinction between categories and existentials, between the what-question and the who-question, between the common anyone-self and the proper self of a unique one-time-only lifetime. "*All* men are mortal" is generic and common, stating a neutral scientific fact, while "*each* of us must die our own death" is hermeneutically distributive and individuating, singling out each to come to terms with their very own facticity of being-t/here.

This singling out of each of us to come to terms with ourselves in our very own facticity of being-here is the proper function of FORMAL INDICATION. The formally indicative concepts of philosophy are designed to call each of us, first, to confront our limit situations in life – from death to simply being-here in existence – and then, steeled by this hefty dose of finitude and in a continuing spirit of ruthless confrontation, to assume a persevering stance of resolute openness toward my own concretely unique situation of be-ing and its particular while of history, in order to own up fully to this concretion that is my individual being-here and properly make it my very own. Heidegger designates this "transformation of ourselves into the Dasein within ourselves" as both a conversion experience and a self-authenticating experience, a proper act of self-identification in be-ing. It is an acknowledgement that our ontic and ontological identity is to be found in our temporality and historicality. After all, I myself *am* my time, we ourselves *are* our history, to be sure, not an objective history but rather a history-in-actualization.

Theodore Kisiel

134.
MODERNITY (*NEUZEIT*)

Neuzeit, a somewhat old-fashioned term for "modernity," literally means "New Age." Heidegger uses the term to contrast the stage of Western METAPHYSICS that began "three centuries ago" (GA16:677/HR 330) with Greek antiquity and the Middle Ages. Modernity arrives at its completed or consummate form in the age of TECHNOLOGY (see, e.g., GA50:149). Although he calls it the "nihilistic" (GA5:218/163), "godless" (GA5:76/58) age of "planetary technology" (GA16:668/HR 324; cf. GA90), modernity should not be defined in terms of the political, social, religious, scientific, or technological revolutions that have marked it since the 1600s, but rather by their common, hidden source. The concept of modernity is central to Heidegger's apocalyptic vision of Western culture in crisis. Complicating attempts to interpret that vision, however, are his idiosyncratic notions of the HISTORY of metaphysics and the "ESSENCE" of SCIENCE and technology. This article aims to clarify the relations among these ideas.

For Heidegger, historical epochs are marked by incommensurable interpretations of what it is *to be a thing* and what it means *to be true*. This may seem strange: how can there be different views about ideas as basic as "BEING" and "TRUTH"? Haven't things always been just *things*? Didn't "true" and "false" mean the same for the Greeks or medievals as for us? Heidegger argues that it is just the apparent self-evidence (SZ 2, 4, and *passim*) of such terms that occludes alternative interpretations, leading us to neglect (GA20:147ff.) or forget (GA5:221–22/165–66; SZ 2; cf. SZ 5, 169) the "question of [the sense of] being" (SZ 2, 215, 403), and so be blind to the inner nature of other historical epochs and our own. Since it is within the undiscerned metaphysical horizon of "being" that modern scientific, religious, political, and other discourses are conducted, it is only by clearly defining it that we can grasp their common modern "essence." Thus Heidegger unearths archaic conceptions of being and truth, so as to expose the roots of our own conceptions, and their implications for the future of humanity. His admittedly awkward (GA16:671/HR 326) name for this essence is "*das Ge-Stell*," the INVENTORY or SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT(ION)ING.[1] Since Heidegger views the sciences as the clearest manifestation of modernity (GA5:76/58), explicating their presuppositions will clarify the nature of *Ge-Stell*, and so too the essence of modernity.

The German word *Wissenschaft* has a broader scope than its English equivalent, "science." Accordingly, Heidegger's analysis of science applies to the "historical" or "cultural" sciences (*Geisteswissenschaften*, i.e., the humanities and social sciences) as well as the natural sciences (*Naturwissenschaften*).[2] Natural and historical scientists have their work cut out for them by this first separation of entities into the two domains of nature and history. Within each domain they

---

[1] GA7:20/QCT 19, and *passim*. "*Ge-Stell*" has been poorly translated as "the Enframing"; it simply means "frame" in the sense of "rack," "framework," "scaffolding," and hence connotes a "set-up" (cf. *aufgestellt*) or "system" (cf. Greek *sustēma < sunistēmi*, "to set together, combine"), an inventory where the STANDING RESERVE is placed on call.

[2] GA5:75–76/57–58. Cf. esp. Bambach 1995; Kim 2015, 42ff. (*Kulturwissenschaften*).

must seek the laws by which natural and historical phenomena become explicable (GA5:80–81/ 60–61).

For Heidegger, both this initial scission of domains and the respective legislation of their constitutive laws reveal several key features of the metaphysical presuppositions of the sciences. First (a), these are taken for granted by all who work within a given domain. As metaphysical projective drafts (*Entwürfe*),[3] these presuppositions are not empirical discoveries. Rather, "nature" and "history" are the conditions of possibility of all empirical discoveries, natural or historical. Second (b), only what can be subsumed under a law may count as a "natural"[4] or "historical" object, and thus as an entity at all. Hence Heidegger argues that modern science understands the being of entities – what makes a thing be a thing – in terms of objectivity (*Gegenständlichkeit*): only what has "objective reality" is "real," i.e., "has being" (GA5:79–80/ 60–61). Third (c), both the laws and the domains of their jurisdiction are laid down and imposed upon what-is.

These three points are important for grasping the nature of the modern age. First, modernity is marked by ontological imperialism (c). That is, the a priori division of entities into history and nature amounts to planting the flag of science on the wild shore of REALITY: it may be as yet uncharted, but is nonetheless claimed for knowledge. Henceforward, cultural and natural phenomena must bend and answer[5] to the laws of historical and natural science, respectively (b). That is, legislating the laws of each domain constitutes their respective phenomena as objects, viz., as objects of knowledge. Once phenomena are thus objectivated, they may be cognized, namely by being fixed by law "over against [*gegen*]" the cognizing subject. In other words, a phenomenon counts as a thing just when it can be "presented"[6] (*vor-gestellt*) before the cognizing subject, as the latter's ob-ject (*Gegen-stand*). Arresting and calling the phenomena to account before the law is what the scientific trial, assay, or experiment does (GA5:80/61). Should an experiment fail or succeed, a hypothesis be confirmed or invalidated (GA5:81/ 61–62), the legal method or procedure itself is in any case confirmed (GA5:79/60, and *passim*).

Looking back to (a), we can see that the initial claim of being "for" science was already determined by this interpretation of being, viz. as being-represented or "set-up-over-against," since "nature" and "history" name the ways in which entities may (and must) most generally be represented or set before us (*vorgestellt*) as objects. Thus, the notion of representation (*Vorstellung*) is the metaphysical cornerstone not only of law-bound objectivity, but also of the ontic domains governed by those laws. And this total nexus of settings, fixings, and re-presentings gives rise to what Heidegger calls the "INVENTORY" (*Ge-Stell*). In modernity, ontic domains are defined, and laws legislated by the knowing subject. Hence, an object is always constituted for the subject in his own terms, even if the object *seems* to exist independently of the subject. That is, because (a) the subject takes the domains for granted, and misconstrues the laws themselves as "objective" (i.e., as given), the scientist is (*qua* scientist) oblivious to his own involvement in the legislative making of his world.

Heidegger observes a basic tension between modernity's characteristic objectivism (*Sachlichkeit*), on the one hand, and its concurrent obsession with the human subject, on the other (GA5:92/69–70). His theory of representation (*Vorstellung*) resolves the tension, by

---

[3] GA5:78/59–60. Cf. esp. Kant 1998, B xiii; A335/B392. [4] See esp. GA5:78/59–60. [5] Cf. Natorp 1994, 133–34.
[6] "*Vorstellung*" is usually translated as "representation"; it literally means "setting-up [*Stellung*] before or in front of one [*Vor-*]." Cf. GA5:89/67.

showing how object and subject are not opposed to each other. Rather, precisely by legislatively constituting objects, the subject at once makes itself the central point of reference (*Bezugsmitte*) of all reality.[7] Heidegger thus overturns the commonplace that sees ancient and medieval man's immature self-centeredness overturned by the Copernican Revolution. On the contrary, pre-modern man places the divine at the "center" of things, with the human at its shining margins; it is modern humanism that first claims for itself the "God's-eye view," from which all reality is laid out before him as a map: the *Weltbild* or "world-picture." "The basic process of modernity is the conquest of the world as picture."[8]

Entities are "unconcealed" – i.e., appear *as* entities – to moderns just insofar as they can be "explained," i.e., insofar as they are mapped onto, and so inscribed in the "world-picture" (GA5:81/61). In plainer terms, the ontology of representation is bound up with[9] the modern theory of truth as correspondence (cf. esp. SZ 214ff.). A statement is "true" for the modern scientist just when the object (*res*) corresponds to the (thought in the) subject (*intellectus*) (cf. esp. GA9:232ff./178ff.). Whereas one might take this to mean that the mind correctly represents the mind-independent object, on Heidegger's analysis of subject–object interdependence, correspondence turns out *really* to mean that the object's constitution (by the legislating subject) does not conflict logically with the subject's (other, already legislated or more basic) laws. In other words, the correspondence theory turns out to be a coherence theory of truth: only what fits the framework of laws, thus finding its place in the world-picture, counts as real.

Heidegger uses the world-picture to elucidate many aspects of modern science and give them a coherent interpretation. For example, modern scientists typically conceive of their work as "research," which gains social and institutional realization in the proliferation of research teams, laboratories, institutes, foundations, universities, prizes, and publications. On the theory of *Ge-Stell*, this research imperative and its endless ramification into new disciplines and sub-disciplines have a common root. For the initial projection (*Entwurf*) that establishes the domain of nature[10] is a "project" in two senses. On the one hand, "nature" is an Idea[11] superimposed on the less determinate notion of "being" or "reality." Calling the sum total of sensible entities "Nature," just is to declare them subordinate *in principle* to a certain system of laws, viz., those that will reveal them "objectively." On the other hand, because these laws have not yet been all legislated (or "discovered"), and the phenomena not entirely determined, the projected Idea of nature appears as a task to be fulfilled. The pursuit of this task is "research."

Once the general domain has been marked off, the exploration of its subordinate districts (*Gegenstandsbezirke*) is in principle infinite, for any region may be but the threshold of an unsuspected set of new regions, and any region is subject to endless articulation.[12] As we often hear, new discoveries "raise more questions" than they answer, sparking the proliferation

---

[7] GA5:88/67, 94/71. Cf. esp. GA5:93/70 on "die für das Wesen der Neuzeit entscheidende *Verschränkung* der beiden Vorgänge, daß die Welt zum Bild und der Mensch zum Subjectum wird."

[8] GA5:94/71. On "Weltbild der Neuzeit" as a pleonasm, see GA5:90/68.

[9] Whether the theory of truth is prior to the ontology of *Vorstellung*, or vice versa, or whether they are "equiprimordial," is a difficult question.

[10] And culture; for the sake of simplicity, the discussion deals only with nature.

[11] Cf. esp. the Kantian Idea, "World," in the first *Critique*.

[12] GA5:77ff./59ff., esp. 86f./64f. This picture of science as an infinite process of objectivation within a projected system is likely inspired by Kant's transcendental Ideas. Their function is to order empirical cognitions, so as to "give them such unity as they can have in their maximal expanse" (Kant 1998, A643/B671; cf. esp. A647/B675). On *Bereich*, *Bezirk*, cp. the third *Critique* (Kant 1990, Introduction, Part II, "Vom Gebiete der Philosophie überhaupt").

of subdisciplinary research projects and their institutional and technical infrastructure. Although the centrifugal force of specialization seems to turn the university into a Babel in which neighboring labs speak alien idioms, yet the special sciences remain unified in the procedure (*Verfahren*) of law-bound research, i.e., systematically mapping, articulating, and representing their districts (*Bezirke*). Everywhere, a single prime directive – "the law of law-fulness" with which all entities must accord – ramifies into the infinite task of *Forschung*, the project of fully representing the world. Hence, modernity is not the *Neuzeit* just because it is most "recent," but because it essentially, perpetually *generates* the new (GA5:91/69; GA7:15/ QCT 14).

Alan Kim

FURTHER READING

Bambach 1995, Bernstein 1991a, Bernstein 1991b, Cassirer 1910, De Warren and Staiti 2015, Kim 2004, Kim 2005, Kim 2015, Tugendhat 1970.

135.
MOMENT (*AUGENBLICK*)

A MOMENT OR "MOMENT of vision" is an experience of insight into one's situation, an insight that breaks through the fallen TEMPORALITY of EVERYDAYNESS and confronts one with one's own, authentic, and historical temporality.

One forerunner of the moment of vision in Heidegger's thought is the Greek concept of *kairos*. For the classical tradition, including Aristotle, a *kairos* is a decisive moment or a suitable opportunity that is disclosed by prudence or *phronesis* (GA18:188–91; GA19:163–64; GA62:383–84). For early Christians, the *kairos* is a transformative time when the world is revealed anew in relation to God. Heidegger's early conception of meaningful time, in which key moments can reconfigure the sense of life, is sometimes described as "kairological." His concept of the moment can be seen as combining the classical and Christian senses of *kairos*: the moment is a turning point that has practical consequences in a situation and is also a transformative experience.

Another precedent for Heidegger is Kierkegaard's conception of the moment (*Øieblikket*), a conception that is itself deeply Christian. For the Christian, as understood by Kierkegaard in works such as *Philosophical Fragments*, the arrival of Christ is a turning point in history, the revelation of a new truth that cannot be grasped through Socratic recollection. One's own becoming a Christian by virtue of the leap of faith is a similar turning point within the course of one's own life, an ungroundable transformation into a new kind of existence. Heidegger gives credit to Kierkegaard's description of the moment as an "existentiell phenomenon" (SZ 338n.); he even says in one lecture course that with the concept of the moment, Kierkegaard has made a new epoch in philosophy possible (GA29/30:225). However, Heidegger sets aside Kierkegaard's specifically Christian interpretation of the moment, along with Kierkegaard's attempt to articulate his experiences by way of various appropriations of Hegelian and Greek metaphysics (GA24:408; GA49:19–76).

One more significant touchstone for Heidegger is Nietzsche's notion of the moment, as presented in works such as *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*. Heidegger interprets this notion in the context of Nietzsche's metaphysics of the eternal recurrence of the same.

Heidegger's own concept of the moment needs to be understood in terms of his own project of interpreting BEING and DASEIN. This project includes a critique of the ideal of INTUITION (*Anschauung*, literally "looking at") that has guided traditional Western metaphysics. The act of intuiting is directed toward a particular mode of being, occurrentness (SZ 147). By taking occurrentness as the paradigmatic or central sense of being, the tradition has distorted and narrowed being. Likewise, intuition has inappropriately served as the standard against which all modes of encountering entities and being have been judged. Intuitive "seeing" – the contemplation of the occurrent – has crowded out other ways of behaving and perceiving.

But instead of rejecting the language of vision altogether, Heidegger's strategy is to broaden the concept of seeing so that it embraces non-intuitive experiences (SZ 147). For example,

CIRCUMSPECTION (*Umsicht*) is the kind of "sight" that is proper to experience in an environment (*Umwelt*, SZ 69). It is not intuition, but a pragmatic understanding or know-how.

Similarly, the moment of vision (*Augenblick*, literally a glance of the eye) is not an intuitive beholding, but a broad encounter with one's own temporality in its full scope. It arises as an authentic response to experiences such as ANXIETY that pull one out of one's fallen, everyday temporality. By facing up to one's own mortality and owning up to one's own indebted responsibility, one can become an authentic individual who resolutely accepts being-toward-death (SZ 305–10). RESOLUTENESS (*Entschlossenheit*) is a form of disclosedness (*Erschlossenheit*) that decidedly reveals the "Situation" in which one can act (SZ 326, 328). In a resolute moment of vision, Dasein is brought face to face with the Situation and what it requires (SZ 338, 410). Dasein meets its fate, in the sense that it resolutely brings itself back to the "there" that is disclosed in the moment of vision (SZ 386).

Thus, in the moment of vision, we enter a more profound and ecstatic time (GA4:39/57, 173/197). In the everyday experience of time, every present "now" is familiar and routine. In objectified, scientific concepts of time, all "nows" are identically occurrent and subject to quantification. In contrast, although the moment of vision is also a form of the present, it is superior and unique – a crux from whose vantage point one can survey one's current world, acting in light of what has been and what may be (SZ 338, 410; GA29/30:226). The instantaneous "now" is thus derivative from the ecstatic moment (GA24:407–09), and only in the moment can one break through the fallen, restricted, perhaps boring temporality of the everyday "now" (GA29/30:224).

The sudden, transformative nature of the moment of vision resembles a lightning bolt, one of Heidegger's favorite images in his later thought (e.g., GA39:30–31; GA65:28, 228, 409). The lightning-like moment is an important precursor of the concept of ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*, also translated "appropriating event") that he develops in the 1930s. The *Contributions to Philosophy* (1936–38) interpret time-space in terms of the "site of the moment" (*Augenblicksstätte*, GA65:323), a site that is to be founded in a unique INCEPTION. In this site and at this moment, EARTH and world can clash (GA65:30) and a decision about the divine can take place (GA65:230, 264, 411). The moment is, in this sense, "the time of being" (GA65:508) and even the origin of time itself (GA66:114).

Heidegger also often uses the word *Augenblick* in a looser and more ordinary sense, as when he reflects on "the historical moment" (e.g., GA69:20). But one can see such reflections as his attempts to grasp a situation by entering a moment of vision in the stricter sense.

Heidegger's general concept of the moment of vision can be accused of formalism: he does no more than hint at what kind of phenomena are specifically illuminated in this moment. The moment simply reveals that our task is "to be there" (GA29/30:246). Furthermore, he offers no criteria for deciding whether a momentary vision is genuine or illusory. To these difficulties is added Heidegger's personal lack of prudential judgment: in 1934, the "moment" of being-there takes the form "We are here! We are ready! Let it happen!" (GA38:57/50), where the "we" is apparently a PEOPLE (*Volk*) that affirms an authoritarian state. Yet despite this communal impulse, the Heideggerian moment of vision is an essentially private and incommunicable decision on which authentic relations with others are subsequently grounded (GA24:408; GA38:19/16). Thus, one could well object that a more universal and rational concept of insight is required, a kind of insight that involves articulate discussion and deliberation about particulars in the light of intelligible principles.

Heidegger might retort that since the moment of vision reveals a concrete and unique situation, it is not possible to specify its content philosophically; he could add that rational communication may well unfold within superficial everydayness, with no connection to the deeper sources of the concepts and principles that such communication deploys. Such sources are revealed in moments that are necessarily rare (GA29/30:428) and sudden (GA66:114). When it comes to limit situations and fundamental decisions, perhaps a moment of vision is required.

Richard Polt

FURTHER READING

McNeill 1999, McNeill 2001, Ó Murchadha 2013, Ruin 1998, Van Buren 1994, von Falkenhayn 2003

136.
MOOD (*STIMMUNG*)

Mood is the fundamental way in which DASEIN is open to itself and its WORLD. It is a mode of DISPOSEDNESS (*Befindlichkeit*) and so of self-finding, in which Dasein is attuned to itself and its surroundings in some determinate way. Mood is equiprimordial with UNDERSTANDING (*Verstehen*), and with it is constitutive for Dasein's DISCLOSEDNESS. Heidegger's disclosive interpretation of what we would ordinarily think of as mood or emotion produces an account of affectivity that departs significantly from traditional theories in philosophy and psychology. Heidegger wholly rejects traditional psychological accounts of affective phenomena, and he does not make the familiar distinctions between affects, feelings, emotions, and moods. (This is one reason that many people prefer "attunement" over "mood" as a translation of *Stimmung*.) While Heidegger mentions many moods, he discusses only a few in any detail: fear, boredom, and the ground-moods or fundamental attunements (*Grundstimmungen*) ANXIETY, profound BOREDOM, wonder, shock, and (holy) mourning. Because fundamental moods reveal Dasein as such and entities as a whole, they play a central role in Heidegger's philosophical method, in poetry's ability to found new worlds, and in Dasein's becoming authentic.

As Macquarrie and Robinson note in their 1963 English translation of *Being and Time*, "The noun 'Stimmung' originally means the tuning of a musical instrument, but it has taken on several other meanings and is the usual word for one's mood or humour" (see fn. 3 to SZ 134). Heidegger often plays on the musical resonance of the term, and he uses musical imagery to describe mood or attunement in GA29/30: attunement is like "a melody that does not merely hover over the so-called proper being at hand of the human, but that sets the tone for such being, i.e., attunes [*stimmt*] and determines [*bestimmt*] the manner and way of its being" (GA29/30:101). As we see in this passage, mood (*Stimmung*) is closely associated with determination (*Bestimmung*), as it is also with voice (*Stimme*).

Like sensation (SZ 137), mood is a mode – an "exponent" (GA20:353) or ontic expression – of disposedness (*Befindlichkeit*). Moods are thus to be understood as ways in which Dasein finds itself (*sich befinden*) amidst entities. In its mood, Dasein is revealed to itself in its *how it is and how things are going*. Since Dasein finds itself as it *already* is, moods temporalize in terms of the past (having been) and are the primary ways in which Dasein is revealed in its thrownness. Of course, self-disclosure is always also world-disclosure. In its mood, Dasein finds itself in some situation and context, dealing with particular entities – including other cases of Dasein – that matter to it in some way or another. It is only in the mood of fear, for example, that Dasein can discover an entity as threatening. In general, "In attunement there occurs the inaugural exposure to entities" (GA39:143).

Because they are disclosive, moods or attunements should not be thought of as occurrent inside a subject, or as subjective colorings imposed on an objective, neutral world. Heidegger rarely discusses mood without scathingly dismissing all "psychology of feelings." According to Heidegger, the proper thinking of mood began with Aristotle and has not progressed since.

Heidegger dwells extensively on Aristotle's account of *pathē* or affects in GA18 (although there, he uses not *Stimmung* but *Befindlichkeit*, translated as "disposition," which corresponds to Aristotle's *diathesis*, "disposition"). Aristotle's *Rhetoric* inspires Heidegger to develop the tripartite schema that he uses to analyze attunements in *Being and Time* and GA20, where he contrasts fear and anxiety by distinguishing their in-the-faces-of-which, about-whiches, and attunings-as-such. Although he does not use this schema again, many of the key features of moods remain unchanged from the early, Aristotle-inspired account.

In particular, on the basis of his interpretation of Aristotle's *hedonē* (usually: pleasure) and *lupē* (usually: pain), Heidegger thinks moods as a matter of being either "elevated" or "depressed" (GA20:351) – in high or low spirits – with regard to what they reveal. Some moods reveal Dasein's being to it as a burden (e.g., the "pallid, evenly balanced lack of mood," SZ 134), while others "alleviate the manifest burden of being" (e.g., elation, SZ 134). Most of the moods that Heidegger mentions are plainly either "elevated" (e.g., joy, hope, bliss, gaiety) or "depressed" (e.g., sadness, melancholy, anger), and most of those that appear neutral can plausibly be sorted into the one or the other category (e.g., equanimity, indifference). Whether they reveal or alleviate the burden, all moods bring Dasein "before its being as 'there'" (SZ 134).

Since we are constitutively open to ourselves and our world, we must always be attuned in some way. Heidegger puts this in *Being and Time* by saying that understanding is always attuned (just as attunements are always understanding; SZ 142–43). If Dasein is always attuned, then attunements or moods cannot be fleeting feelings. Further, the term must cover more than just the powerful moods that usually attract our attention. While Heidegger tends to think of moods as "powerful forces that permeate and envelop us," "com[ing] over us and things together with one fell swoop" (GA39:89), most everyday moods will be more subtle. Even the "*tranquil tarrying alongside*" of *theōria* (SZ 138) is a mood, as is the "pallid lack of attunement [*Ungestimmtheit*] which dominates the 'grey everyday'" (SZ 345). "[E]ven the coldness of calculation, even the prosaic sobriety of planning are traits of an attunement [*Gestimmtheit*]" (GA11:24–25/WP 91). There is no condition in which we are not attuned; "There is only ever a change of mood" (GA29/30:102).

Moods are passive and pervasive. While we can to some extent control our moods (although only ever by way of a counter-mood, *Gegenstimmung*), we do not *have* them so much as they have *us*. Moods dis-place or trans-port us into some particular relationship to entities and ourselves, not only without our choice but indeed "*prior to* all cognition and volition" (SZ 136). Moods are in fact "the 'presupposition' for, and 'medium' of thinking and acting" (GA29/30:102). As such a medium, climate, or mise-en-scène, moods are pervasive. Thus Heidegger memorably describes mood as "an atmosphere in which we first immerse ourselves in each case and which then attunes us through and through [*durchstimmt*]" (GA29/30:100).

The image of the atmosphere also helps us to recognize that moods can be shared and socially transmitted. They belong to Dasein as ʙᴇɪɴɢ-ᴡɪᴛʜ. Discussing being with a grieving person, Heidegger points out that "He draws us into the manner in which he is, although we do not necessarily feel any grief ourselves" (GA29/30:100). Heidegger goes on to identify profound boredom as the shared attunement of the entire age. Of course, Aristotle already understood this feature of mood: his discussion of *pathē* in the *Rhetoric* concerns how the orator can control the mood of the crowd. This makes Aristotle's analysis of *pathē* "the first systematic hermeneutic of the everydayness of being with one another" (SZ 138).

All moods "arise out of BEING-IN-THE-WORLD" (SZ 136) (as always being-with), but *fundamental* attunements or ground-moods (*Grundstimmungen*) come from "the ground of the essence of Dasein" (GA29/30:238), from the homeland (GA39:88), or from being as ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*; see, e.g., GA65:21). They can be awakened by poets and philosophers, and they are distinctive in that they directly disclose what other moods reveal only indirectly: Dasein as such and entities as a whole.

It is through such a fundamental attunement that a case of Dasein can come to its AUTHENTICITY. To become authentic, Dasein must face up to itself in a mood that turns toward its thrown being. Most of Dasein's ordinary moods turn away from Dasein's thrown being; they do reveal Dasein to itself, but only indirectly, in fleeing from it. Thus authenticity requires a fundamental attunement – anxiety in *Being and Time*, and profound boredom in GA29/30 (§38b).

For the same reason – that is, their disclosive scope – fundamental attunements are crucial for Heidegger's philosophical method. In GA29/30, Heidegger argues that in order to be really *gripped* by philosophical questions, we must be in some fundamental attunement. Further, simply in aiming to awaken a fundamental attunement, we find ourselves questioning philosophically. Awakening the fundamental attunement *is* philosophizing. Thus Heidegger expends great energy attempting to awaken the fundamental attunement of profound boredom in his audience.

However, the boredom that Heidegger hopes to awaken in GA29/30 cannot be as methodologically powerful as the fundamental attunement of anxiety, which he discusses in *Being and Time* and in "What is Metaphysics?" (GA9). For while boredom – like joy in the presence of the Dasein of a person whom we love – reveals entities as a whole, it does not reveal the nothing (GA9:111/87). Anxiety does reveal this (although Heidegger does not appear to attempt to awaken anxiety but only to recall or imagine it).

While anxiety may be the mood of Heidegger's philosophizing, the fundamental attunement that inaugurated Western philosophizing is wonder: "the fundamental attunement [*Grundstimmung*] of the first beginning is *wonder* [*Er-staunen*]: wonder that entities are and that humans themselves are and are in the midst of that which *they* are not" (GA65:46; cf. GA45). Thus both Plato (*Theaetetus* 155d) and Aristotle (*Metaphysics* 982b12) grounded philosophy in *thaumazein*, wonder (e.g., GA11:22/WP 79, 81; GA45:155). (Heidegger discusses wonder at some length in GA45.) The mood of modern philosophy, in contrast, is doubt and/or confidence (GA11:24/WP 87, 89).

Still, Heidegger chooses profound boredom to awaken in GA29/30 because it is or was the fundamental attunement of the age. Even though it is suppressed or concealed, it is boredom that determines what is and what matters for us. Heidegger builds on this way of thinking about attunement in the 1930s, when he stops thinking fundamental attunements as modes of disposedness (GA66:320) and thinks them instead as "the style [*Art*] of the interpretation of being" (GA66:271). Understood as such, fundamental attunements determine and attune – and in some sense *are* – worlds or understandings of being. Thus in GA39 Heidegger lists the essential characteristics of mood as: "(1) a transporting out into entities as a whole, (2) a transporting into the EARTH, (3) an opening up of entities, and (4) a grounding of BEYNG" (GA39:181).

Change in such a fundamental attunement is a change in the understanding of being. This is why the other INCEPTION – the birth of the next new age for our Dasein – requires

a new fundamental attunement: foreboding (*Er-ahnen*), shock (*Er-schreken*), or RESTRAINT (*Verhaltenheit*, e.g., GA65:20, 46; GA45). We must be shocked both by the fact that being has abandoned us (GA65:46; see ABANDONMENT OF BEING) and by the very fact that entities *are* (GA65:15). But becoming thus shocked falls outside the scope of our agency, since "only a fundamental attunement is capable of bringing about a change of attunement [*Umstimmung*] from the ground up – that is, a transformation of Dasein that amounts to a complete recreating of its exposure to entities, and thereby to a recoining of beyng" (GA39:142). At most, a new fundamental attunement can be founded by poets, in conjunction with thinkers and statespeople (GA39:144). As Heidegger explains: "the poet speaks from out of an attunement [*Stimmung*], an attunement that determines and attunes [*be-stimmt*] the ground and soil that permeates [*durchstimmt*] the space upon which and within which the poetic telling founds a way of being" (GA39:79). (It is because poetry is attuned and attuning in this way that Hölderlin's poetry is so important for Heidegger in the 1930s.) But insofar as it is the fundamental attunement itself that drives the change in the understanding of being, fundamental attunements have an "adaptation-character" (*Ereignis-Charakter*, GA66:320).

So fundamental attunements or ground-moods (*Grundstimmungen*) are grounding in at least two senses: they lie at the ground of our current openness to entities, opening the world and opening Dasein to itself, and they can ground or inaugurate a new age or world. Because they ground in this way, fundamental attunements are not simply more pervasive or "deeper" than ordinary moods. They must somehow make ordinary moods possible. This perhaps accounts for the internal complexity of the fundamental attunements that Heidegger discusses in the 1930s, which is not shared by the anxiety or boredom that Heidegger discusses in the 1920s. For instance, in GA65 the fundamental attunement of the other beginning is a single phenomenon encompassing shock (*Erschrecken*), restraint (*Verhaltenheit*), diffidence (*Scheu*), presentiment (*Ahnung*), and foreboding (*Er-ahnen*), all "attuned [*gestimmt*] and attuning [*stimmend*] in unison with one another" (GA65:396). In GA39 the complexity unfolds temporally: the single fundamental attunement of holy mourning comes fully into its essence by transitioning from abandonment to distress to readiness (GA39:103). The holy mourning that attunes Hölderlin's poetry even contains within itself a counter-attunement (*Gegenstimmung*): joy (GA39:148; cf. GA12:222/OWL 153). At one point, Heidegger suggests that it is the relationship between this fundamental attunement and its counter-attunement that determines the other possibilities of attunement for the PEOPLE (GA39:148), but he does not elaborate on how to conceive this relationship between the world-attuning fundamental attunement and the ordinary moods that attune cases of Dasein.

Katherine Withy

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Stimmung(en) SZ §§29–30, §68b; GA29/30:§§17, 21–29; GA39:§§8–9, 11; GA71:§§241–44, 249
Grundstimmung(en) SZ §40; "What is Metaphysics?" in GA9; "Was ist das – die Philosophie?" in GA11/
 WP; GA29/30:§§29–39; GA39:§§8–12, 16; GA45:§§36–40; GA65:§§5, 6, 13, 249; GA71:§§243–48
Aristotle and the *pathē* SZ §§29–30; GA18:§§16–18, 20–21

137.
MOVEMENT (*BEWEGUNG*)

Heidegger regards movement not as a transition between states, but as a basic mode of being, and as such it plays an important role in his ontology (GA18:304; GA65:194). In this respect, Heidegger is following Aristotle's lead – the significance of movement for Heidegger can be traced back to Aristotle's observation that all natural entities (*phusei onta*) are characterized by movement in one way or another (GA19:103).

In his 1924 lecture course *Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy*, Heidegger observes that if movement is "a *mode of the being-there of the* world," it is also "the means by which the being of the world becomes intelligible" (GA18:303–04): thinking and language, then, share in the "way making" that is movement. However, the terms in which movement is usually conceived offer only a partial understanding and Heidegger is concerned to open up a more properly ontological perspective. One could say that much of his work in this early period aimed to elicit the essential characteristics of movement understood in this way.

In the early 1920s, Heidegger calls the "caring" that is characteristic of factical life a movement (S 115–18), and introduces new concepts to present this movement, such as "relucence," "prestruction," and "ruinance" (GA61). These inquiries into the movement of factical life prefigure the *existentiale* that structure the being of Dasein in *Being and Time* and were important in enabling Heidegger to explicate the phenomenon of life while breaking with *Lebensphilosophie*. Elsewhere, the emphasis is more fully placed on a phenomenological interpretation of those concepts through which movement has traditionally been conceived; that is, above all, on potentiality and actuality, Time and space. For this reason, the question of movement, although a continual point of reference for Heidegger, is sometimes eclipsed by analyses of the concepts that shape our experience of movement and the way we speak of it.

Thinking of movement as a mode of being suggests a relation between movement and Aristotle's categories, and Heidegger notes that in each of the categories of being "there resides a determinate relation to motion [*Bewegung*]" (GA19:103). In this respect movement may be regarded as a unifying condition and more fundamental than the categories themselves. So when Aristotle states in Metaphysics IV.1 that being is said in many ways (1003a33), movement is one such way, albeit grasped indirectly through the concepts of potentiality and actuality (GA33:45). In *Aristotle's Metaphysics Θ 1–3: On the Essence and Actuality of Force*, Heidegger insists on a distinction between speaking of potentiality and actuality with regard to the moving thing (*kata kinesin*) and with regard to movement as such (*kata kineseos*) (GA33:44); that is, between treating potentiality and actuality as properties of a given thing and treating them as ways of being characterized by movement. This is also the difference between movement simply as a transition between fixed states, and movement as the ontological condition of an entity characterized by its relation to what it can become and what it has been. In this ontological sense, movement is not secondary to being in some higher sense as permanent and unchanging; that is, as pure actuality. Not only is potentiality itself a mode of being, but one can properly speak of the actuality of potentiality itself: that condition in which a being exists *as* potentiality. Such a condition was

fundamental to the analysis in *Being and Time* of DASEIN as ABILITY-TO-BE (*Seinkönnen*, SZ 86), an idea that makes sense only within the frame of movement as a mode of being.

In *On the Essence and Concept of Phusis in Aristotle's Physics B, 1*, Heidegger uses the term "movedness" (*Bewegtheit*) to refer to the essence of movement from which both movement and rest are determined (GA9:284/216). However, "rest" in this sense is not simply counterposed to movement, for the purest manifestation of the essence of movement is where "movedness is gathered up into *standing still*" (GA9:284/217); for example, Heidegger adds, in activities such as seeing. He is thinking here of the Aristotelian distinction between movement as a linear process with a beginning and an end, and act, activity, or actuality (*energeia*) which has its end in itself. Aristotle, too, uses the example of seeing in this connection, alongside those of understanding, living, and living well (1048b23–27). The highest examples of being as movement are therefore where the movement of a moving being gathers itself into its end, *telos*, and as so gathered within its end, "has" itself (GA9:285/217).

Heidegger also explores the ontological dimension of movement by way of a consideration of time and space. As we usually think of them, time and space cannot open up a sufficiently ontological perspective on movement as a mode of being, which is why in *Being and Time* Heidegger sets aside the common conception of linear time in favor of the original TEMPORALITY of Dasein, and empty Cartesian extension space in favor of the phenomenological spatiality of Dasein's BEING-IN-THE-WORLD. In *Contributions to Philosophy* (GA65), Heidegger goes further, speaking of the there of Da-sein as time-space (*Zeit-Raum*), a dimension prior to the separation of time and space into distinct forms (GA65:189). Time-space has a dynamic character inseparable from ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*), the event of the grounding of the there itself.

Time-space features again in the 1957 lecture "The Nature of Language" in *On the Way to Language*. Reflecting on what it means to speak of nearness, Heidegger proposes that it involves being "face-to-face" with another human being, or even with a THING, and that this has nothing to do with calculation or measurement in customary forms of "parametric" time and space (GA12:199/OWL 103). In the first instance it is the EARTH and sky, god and man, that are face-to-face, to which Heidegger adds that it is movement, understood as nearness, that holds together these four regions – two marking a spatial difference, two marking a temporal difference (see FOURFOLD). Finally, if it is through movement that the earth and sky, god and man, face each other, this movement is also characterized by language. As the saying of being, language is said to be the "way-making movement" (*das Be-wëgende*) that holds the four regions together (GA12:203/OWL 108).

From his early analyses of factical life to his late essays on language, Heidegger's thinking is never far from the question of movement, which remains fundamental to his understanding of the way human beings encounter and make sense of being.

David Webb

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA9:243–44/186–87, 248/190–91; 266/203, 271–72/207–08, 276/211, 284–85/216–20, 298/228;
    GA12:200, 202, 203/OWL 104, 106, 108; GA18:237–39, 287–329; GA19:43–46, 101–03, 113–14,
    118, 478–82, 487–99, 536–57, 578–79; GA22:170–81; GA33:207–44, 49–56, 68, 79, 84–85, 97–98,
    112–13, 149–56, 210–24; GA61:93, 117–55; GA63:51; GA65:104, 193–94, 280, 472; SZ 91, 97, 362,
    375, 389, 421, 428; S 115–18

Movedness (*Bewegtheit*) GA9:244–45/187, 248–52/190–93, 257/197, 266/203, 271–72/207–08, 276/211, 283–88/216–20, 293/224, 298/228; GA19:46; GA65:194; GA61:93, 117–55, 157; SZ 134, 177–80, 348, 389

FURTHER READING

Backman 2006, Brogan 2005, Campbell 2012, Sadler 2001, Sheehan 1981

138.
MYSTERY (*GEHEIMNIS*)

Mystery is the general and constitutive concealment that prevails over being and all that is. One of the central points of Heidegger's entire phenomenological approach is that something is unconcealed only against the background of this general concealment. Consequently, the mystery concerns essential aspects of Heidegger's philosophy such as LANGUAGE and TRUTH and is particularly connected to the CONCEPT of BEING (*Sein*).

First of all, for Heidegger a mystery is not something that is not, or not yet properly, known. He explicitly says that the mystery is not something that cannot be explained adequately in a scientific manner (GA54:92–93). The openness of the mystery is not its explanation but on the contrary the acceptance of a general concealment (GA54:93). The structure of this concealment can be elucidated with Heidegger's main point that every disclosure or UNCONCEALMENT (*Entbergung*) can only be understood against the background of a concealment (*Verbergung*). This also is the core of Heidegger's concept of truth as ALÊTHEIA. The structure of unconcealment through concealment is explicitly connected with the mystery (GA7:26/QCT 25; GA67:233), which in turn is specified as the essence of truth (*Wesen der Wahrheit*, GA9:196/150) or even as the highest mode of truth (*höchste Gestalt der Wahrheit*, GA39:119). In a metaphorical way, Heidegger illustrates the structure of unconcealment through concealment with the expression that the darkness (*das Dunkle*) is the mystery of the light (*des Lichten*, GA11:138/BFL 88; GA79:93). Another metaphor for this structure is the simultaneous nearness and distance of the mystery (GA12:223/OWL 154), which is combined again with a metaphor of light: The supposed distance of the mystery turns out to be an incomprehensible nearness and is spelled out as the CLEARING (*Lichtung*, GA7:287–88/EGT 121–22).

Furthermore, the mystery is not a particular mystery about concrete entities, but the concealing of what is concealed as a whole, of entities as such (GA9:194/148–49). This leads to Heidegger's concept of being (*Sein*), which can be interpreted as an expression of the inconceivable fact of the existence of entities as such. In a famous phrase, Heidegger illustrates the concept of being as the miracle of all miracles: that entities are (*Wunder aller Wunder*, *dass Seiendes ist*, GA9:307/234). But entities are not only a miracle, but also a mystery, since Heidegger equates the mystery with the center of BEYNG (*Mitte des Seyns*, GA39:285) and with beyng itself, which, as a mystery, can be named in POETRY (GA39:250–51). In addition, he identifies the essence of the mystery (*Wesen des Geheimnisses*) with the truth of being (*Wahrheit des Seins*, GA5:265/197) and discusses the mystery of being (*Geheimnis des Seins*, ibid.). According to the above-mentioned characterization of the mystery as general concealment, the highest mystery of beyng (*das höchste Geheimnis des Seyns*) is the refusal (*Verweigerung*, GA79:77). An explicit connection of concealment (*Verborgenheit*), truth of the essence of beyng (*Wahrheit der Wesung des Seyns*), ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*), and mystery can be found in the *Contributions to Philosophy*: the mystery of adaptation is its concealment and this is the truth of the essence of beyng (GA65:78).

Another important use of the term "mystery" can be found in Heidegger's philosophy of language. Similar to his general approach, Heidegger refers in this context to the structure of

unconcealment through concealment and claims that the speech of a language (*das Sprechen der Sprache*) is an effect of unconcealment, which he again characterizes as an inapprehensible mystery (*unausdenkliches Geheimnis*, GA7:218/EGT 64) and particularly as the mystery of language (*Geheimnis der Sprache*, GA8:195/191). Again, Heidegger stresses the simultaneous nearness and distance of the mystery, which he also calls the mystery of the word (*Geheimnis des Wortes*, GA12:223/OWL 154). This mystery concerns language, but is itself ineffable (*ibid.*). Moreover, the origin (*Ursprung*) of language is a mystery (GA39:75) and that which cannot be said in words is also called a mystery (GA12:241–42/OWL 122–23).

The last two examples are not directly referring to the structure of unconcealment through concealment and there are some more examples of mystery in Heidegger's texts in a more general sense. DEATH, for example, is called the mystery of being (*Geheimnis des Seins*, GA7:180/PLT 176) or the mystery of life (*Geheimnis des Lebens*, GA16:90, 279) respectively, and he also discusses the mystery of the game (*Geheimnis des Spiels*, GA10:167/112, 169/113) in the context of Heraclitus. While it might be possible to relate these examples to the general concealment, this would be really hard for the mystery of the belfry (*Geheimnis des Glockenturms*, GA13:113–16), to which Heidegger dedicated a small text in 1954.

More important is the question of how to deal with the mystery. This question immediately leads back to the center of Heidegger's philosophy. It is one of its central aims, if not its central aim of all, to provoke a shift in the attitude toward the world. The human being should consider himself as part of an incomprehensible adaptation (*Ereignis*), which Heidegger discusses in his entire philosophy. This is the key idea of his concept of the world in the early lectures, of the BEING-IN-THE-WORLD in *Being and Time*, of adaptation in the *Contributions*, and of the FOURFOLD in his later texts. In terms of the mystery, this aim can be formulated as the demand of conceiving the mystery *as* mystery (GA4:24/42–43), of admiring (*verehren*) the mystery (GA29/30:510) or of letting the mystery be what it is (*das Geheimnis wahrhaft sein lassen*, GA39:119). To conceive the mystery as mystery, the mystery must be obvious (*offenbar*, *ibid.*). Accordingly, Heidegger's concept of a new attitude toward the world, which he sometimes calls RELEASEMENT (*Gelassenheit*), is related to the openness for the mystery (*Offenheit für das Geheimnis*, GA16: 528/DT 55). In an address on releasement in 1955 he explicates the mystery exactly in the aforementioned sense as unconcealment through concealment (*ibid.*) and identifies the mystery with the hidden sense of the technological world and the openness for the mystery with the releasement to things (*ibid.*).

Rico Gutschmidt

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Mystery and concealment GA6.2:334, 336/N4 226–27, 228; GA9:194–98/148–51; GA39:119; GA54:92–93; GA65:78; GA67:233
To conceive the mystery as mystery GA4:24–25/42–44, 28–31/46–49; GA12:140/OWL 50; GA39:119, 234–35, 246–52, 284–85; GA54:93
Mystery and language GA12:217–25/OWL 148–56
Mystery of the belfry GA13:113–16

FURTHER READING

Hatab 1983, Withy 2017, Wrathall 2011

139.
MYTH (*MYTHOS*)

Myth is a "saying word" that makes a claim on human beings – a claim in terms of which things can appear in their ESSENCE (see GA8:12/6).

For a long time, Heidegger's attitude toward myth remained ambivalent. On the one hand, he viewed myths as representing DASEIN's primordial movement in an inauthentic metaphorical manner. Hence, while discussing Dasein's self-disclosedness in 1927/28, he noted that Dasein "does not at first conceptually differentiate between its own manner of being and the manner of being of things toward which Dasein comports itself. So little does Dasein make this differentiation that it identifies its own being with the being of things. This is the case with all mythical thinking" (GA25:24). Myths comprise a fallenness (*Verfallenheit*) of things that impacts everyday concern (*Besorgen*) just as much as philosophy. *Sein und Zeit* is also informed by the notion of myth as a lapse of being (*Seinsverfehlung*), with Heidegger arguing that when we understand ourselves metaphorically and mythically, we are leading an inauthentic existence. On the other hand, the mythical Dasein still has an awareness of the separation between unmeasured and everyday TEMPORALITY, between "unmeasuredness, power" (which overcomes the abstraction of Dasein's transcendental lack of resolve) and "EVERYDAYNESS," i.e., between the time of festivals and the common experience of TIME (as indiscriminately homogeneous).

In those years, Heidegger largely drew his knowledge of myth from Cassirer, as is evident from his reading of the mythic Dasein in his review of the second volume of Cassirer's *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen* in 1928. In it, Heidegger paraphrases Cassirer in the language of *Sein und Zeit*, confronting the fateful structure of myth with everyday temporality, i.e., the sacred with the profane. For Heidegger, myth is pre-scientific science (he primarily assumes an aetiological myth) and rather than being closely related to religion, it is at most religious. Here, Heidegger criticized first and foremost a lack of clarity over the meaning of myth for Dasein: "the interpretation of the essence of myth as a possibility of human Dasein remains random and directionless as long as it cannot be grounded in a radical ONTOLOGY of Dasein in light of the problem of BEING in general" (GA3:255ff.). What was lacking was an analysis of the state or CONSTITUTION of being (*Seinsverfassung*) of the mythical Dasein. "The preoccupation with the neo-Kantian problem of CONSCIOUSNESS is of such little help that it actually prevents gaining a grasp on the central problem." Cassirer does indeed see clearly that the mythical forms of thought and intuition must be traced back to the mythical "form of life," yet in Heidegger's view he fails to offer an "anticipatory elaboration of the basic ontological constitution of Dasein as such" (GA3:266). Here, Heidegger only indicates the form that such an analysis of Dasein should take, doing so by reference to *Sein und Zeit*. In this process, it then becomes evident that the mythical life's basic way of being is determined by THROWNNESS (*Geworfenheit*), its overwhelmedness by the overpowering. Ultimately, Heidegger sees the "importance of Cassirer's work" in "having placed myth as a systemic problem, for the first time since Schelling, once again within the sphere of philosophical inquiry." Yet, he concludes, one has to accept that even

such a rich presentation of the phenomena of SPIRIT "is never at all philosophy itself, whose need first erupts when its few elementary and basic problems, having remained unconquered since antiquity, are newly taken up" (GA3:270).

This call for a new philosophy of myth, taking Schelling and Cassirer as a starting point, paves the way for a re-evaluation of myth in the course of the TURN (*Kehre*). From 1929, the main focus here is initially on W.F. Otto, whose book *Die Götter Griechenlands* offered the first objectivist interpretation of myth, and then Hölderlin and Greek tragedy. By evoking the interrelatedness of poetry and philosophy, Heidegger hoped to recast the experience of the divine so that it could be reinterpreted. The inverse movement of ALÊTHEIA to correctness is intimately connected to myth – the word and the "saying" (*Sage*) – as it forced from its own essence into the contrary of *logos* (GA54:89ff.). It was Homer's language and poetry that gave the Greeks their gods. In this way, Hölderlin is supposed to open the way for Germans to the coming god – providing he is listened to. For this reason, the later Heidegger constantly emphasized that "myth … remains the most memorable" (GA7:136). This, however, is far removed from a historical scholarly "mythology" (GA55:14–15).

Christoph Jamme

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA3:255ff., 263ff.; GA6.1:327/N2 106–07; GA7:130; GA8:12/10; GA19:442; GA26:187; GA27:166, 357ff.; GA28:351; GA29/30:300; GA47:181; GA54:8, 55, 86ff., 162ff.; GA60:329–30

FURTHER READING

Cassirer 1965, Otto 1964

N

140.
NATURE (*NATUR*)

"Nature" refers variously to (1) the specific domain of scientific research, or (2) the correlate of a more poetic mode of being-in-the-world (associated especially with Hölderlin). While the term appears numerous times in Heidegger's corpus, extended discussions of it are surprisingly infrequent. The latter do, however, provide insight into both Heidegger's conception of science (in relation to his broader ontological project) and his critical perspective on modernity.

In Heidegger's chief published work *Being and Time*, nature is introduced in §3, where Heidegger uses the term to designate one of the "regions" or "domains" of entities that can be investigated through scientific research. Any such "region" is constituted by a set of "basic concepts" that furnish "our proximal clues for disclosing this area concretely for the first time" (SZ 9). More specifically, "basic concepts determine the way in which we get an understanding beforehand of the area of subject-matter underlying all the objects a science takes as its theme, and all positive investigation is guided by this understanding" (SZ 10). In §14, however, we learn that the "basic concept" characteristic of this region, i.e., substantiality, is actually derivative of the more primordial phenomenon of "worldhood" (SZ 63). Nature is something that is only disclosed in a specialized mode of Dasein's being-in-the-world (SZ 65). Heidegger tries to make this claim more concrete in §20, where he investigates Descartes' metaphysics of the natural as *res extensa* (SZ 97–101).

A number of passages on nature in *Being and Time* point ahead to discussions of the term in Heidegger's later writings. For example, in §15, building on the claim that the basic concepts constitutive of nature in a scientific sense reflect a derivative mode of being-in-the-world, Heidegger discusses the difference between a scientific conception of nature and one that might be described as broadly poetic or artistic (SZ 70).

The differences between the ways a poet encounters nature and expresses this encounter and the scientific conception of nature are highlighted by Heidegger in a 1941–42 lecture course on Hölderlin. In describing the differences, Heidegger's point is actually that the projection of a basic conception of nature in science involves something akin to the pre-thematic experience articulated by a poet (GA52:39–40). At the same time, Heidegger warns against the exclusivity of a certain conception of nature, calling attention to how nature is configured in such a way that it is "mobilized" for human planning and calculation (GA52:40). An essay on Hölderlin's "As when on a holiday . . ." likewise describes the poet's understanding of nature as "the holy" within the context of "the absolute domination of man over the whole terrestrial globe" (GA4:51/74). One can also cite in this connection the summer 1942 lecture on Hölderlin's "The Ister," where (in §8) Hölderlin's poetic vision is contrasted with the modern projection of a "lifeless" nature as the basis of calculative ordering (GA53:46–59).

In a similar manner, the discussion of Descartes in §20, already referred to above, points ahead to observations Heidegger makes in his 1938 essay "The Age of the World Picture." In the latter, Heidegger casts a more critical eye on the way in which the concept of "value" is

articulated to "round out" features of things that are occluded by the dominance of a certain conception of nature (GA5:101/77). As in *Being and Time*, Heidegger describes how science first of all requires the opening of a "region (*Bezirkes*)," which occurs "through the projection, within some region of (for example, natural) entities, of a ground-plan (*Grundriß*) of natural processes." This, in turn, "maps out in advance" (*zeichnet vor*) the proper methodology (GA5:78/59). When the conception of this "region" comes to be thought of as the "true" being of nature "in itself," then it becomes necessary to account for features of things that are unproblematically present in our more original, non-derivative modes of being-in-the-world.

In §69 of *Being and Time*, Heidegger also deploys the term nature in order to criticize the emergent positivist conception of science, which takes the emphasis on "fact" to be the hallmark of modern approaches. Once again building on the picture introduced in §3, Heidegger maintains that "what is decisive for its development does not lie in its rather high esteem for the observation of 'facts,' nor in its 'application' of mathematics in determining the character of natural processes; it lies rather in *the way in which Nature herself is mathematically projected*" (SZ 362). This projection opens a "horizon" in which "one may be guided by looking at those constitutive items in it which are quantitatively determinable (motion, force, location, and time). Only 'in the light' of a Nature which has been projected in this fashion can anything like a 'fact' be found and set up for an experiment regulated and delimited in terms of this projection" (SZ 362). Heidegger's point is that the extraordinary achievements of modern science are not simply the products of a new concern with the "facts." Instead, the correct account of scientific activity involves an appreciation of the way in which an a priori understanding comes to be "thematized" by researches before the facts even show up as such (SZ 363).

These ideas in *Being and Time* are likewise revisited in Heidegger's lecture for the winter of 1935–36 on Kant. Already in §3 of *Being and Time*, Heidegger had singled out Kant for the achievement of a "productive logic" that delimits the basic concepts constitutive of nature in the scientific sense. In Heidegger's words, "the positive outcome of Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* lies in what it has contributed toward the working out of what belongs to any Nature whatsoever, not in a 'theory' of knowledge. His transcendental logic is an *a priori* logic for the subject-matter of that area of being called 'Nature'" (SZ 10–11). In §18 of the 1935–36 course, Heidegger also revisits his earlier criticisms of positivism (GA41:66–69). Once more emphasizing the a priori dimension of science, Heidegger comments that nature is "the realm of the uniform space-time context of motion, which is outlined in the axiomatic project and in which bodies can be bodies as a part of it and anchored in it" (GA41:93).

Benjamin Crowe

NEARNESS (*NÄHE*). SEE CLOSENESS.

NEED (*NOT*). SEE EMERGENCY.

NEEDFULNESS (*NOT*). SEE EMERGENCY.

NECESSITY (*NOT*). SEE EMERGENCY.

141.
NIHILISM (*NIHILISMUS*)

NIHILISM IS A condition in which we experience no constraints on us coming from the entities we encounter – they show up as having no ESSENCE, as demanding nothing from us, and offering no resistance to our MACHINATIONS. "Nihilism means: with everything in every respect, it is nothing" (GA5:265/110). Heidegger's discussion of nihilism is interwoven with his analysis of the contemporary condition, which he often refers to as the technological age. The way Heidegger reads Nietzsche is crucial to his understanding of contemporary culture and, in many ways, they come to a similar diagnosis – whether understood in terms of nihilism or of TECHNOLOGY. As Heidegger puts it, "to think through Nietzsche's METAPHYSICS becomes a matter of reflecting on the situation and place of contemporary man."[1] But even if Nietzsche is one of Heidegger's key guides to the problems of modern society, Heidegger disagrees with Nietzsche's response to the modern predicament.[2] Nietzsche thinks he finds a way out of the problematic tendencies of nihilism, one which opens the door for a unique stage of human flourishing. Heidegger, however, thinks Nietzsche and his proposed solution epitomize the nihilism of MODERNITY.[3]

Thematically, Heidegger's discussion of nihilism begins with Nietzsche's discussion of the death of God in *The Gay Science* 125:

> The madman jumped into their midst and pierced them with his eyes. "Where is God?" he cried; "I'll tell you! *We have killed him* – you and I! We are all his murderers. But how did we do this? How were we able to drink up the sea? Who gave us the sponge to wipe away the entire horizon? What were we doing when we unchained this earth from its sun? Where is it moving to now? Where are we moving to? Away from all suns? Are we not continually falling? And backwards, sidewards, forwards, in all directions? Is there still an up and a down? Aren't we straying as though through an infinite nothing? . . . God is dead! God remains dead! And we have killed him![4]

Maudemarie Clark interprets the death of God as a metaphor for a cultural event in which "belief in God has become unbelievable, the Christian idea of God is no longer a living force in

---

[1] GA5:210/158. Metaphysics here does not refer to "a specialized discipline of philosophy," but to "the fundamental structure of beings in their entirety, so far as this entirety is differentiated into a sensory and a supersensory world, the former of which is supported and determined by the latter" (GA5:221/165). Heidegger clarifies what he means by "Nietzsche's metaphysics" in GA5:208–09/157–58.

[2] John Richardson, for example, suggests that this divergence is what leads Heidegger's later writings away from Nietzsche and, instead, toward Hölderlin (Richardson 2012, 205).

[3] Unless otherwise noted, descriptions of Nietzsche here focus on the way Heidegger interpreted Nietzsche and (to some degree) bracket the questions of Nietzsche's own views and the accuracy of Heidegger's interpretations of Nietzsche.

[4] Nietzsche 2012, §125. Nietzsche does in fact claim that God is dead, but this rich passage, as Maudemarie Clark points out, comes from the mouth of the madman (Clark 1998, 852).

Western culture."[5] Heidegger focuses on the latter of these two aspects. For him, Nietzsche's claim that "God is dead" emphasizes the way the Christian God "has lost His power over entities and over the determination of man" (GA6.2:24–25/N4 4). When the madman says God is dead, he is saying something different than those in the marketplace who "do not believe in God" (GA5:219/164). One could continue to be guided by the (ideal of the) Christian God, even when one no longer believes in that God. And Western culture could be similarly guided even if the majority of people do not believe in the Christian God. In this context, Christianity refers less to the Christian life than it does to the "historical, secular-political phenomenon of the church and its claim to power within the formation of Western humanity" (GA5:219/164). Even for the religious among us, the landscape has changed.[6] We have gone from "a society where belief in God is unchallenged and indeed, unproblematic, to one in which it is understood to be one option among others, and frequently not the easiest to embrace" (Taylor 2007, 3).

On Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche, "God" and "Christian God" refer even more broadly to the transcendent or to the supersensory world in general: "'ideals' and 'norms,' 'principles' and 'rules,' 'ends' and 'values'" (GA6.2:25/N4 4; see also GA5:216/162). In this vein, the nihilism associated with the death of God means "that the highest values devalue themselves."[7] As Robert Pippin puts it, "we now find nothing truly needful, nothing important worth wanting, worth sacrificing for" (Pippin 2015, 181). So understood, the death of God reflects, as Charles Taylor puts it, "the sense that no framework is shared by everyone, can be taken for granted as the framework *tout court*, can sink to the phenomenological status of unquestioned fact" (Taylor 1989, 17).

Heidegger proposes one potential consequence: "if God – as the supersensory ground and the goal of everything that is real – is dead, if the supersensory world of ideas is bereft of its binding and above all its inspiring and constructive power, then there is nothing left which man can rely on and by which he can orient himself" (GA5:217/163). Nietzsche illustrates this loss of orientation by asking: "where are we moving to? Away from all suns? Are we not continually falling? And backwards, sidewards, forwards, in all directions? Is there still an up and a down?" Without some agreed upon highest values or ideals, a practical disorientation can result.

In *Radical Hope*, Jonathan Lear discusses the devastating and disorienting effects of the collapse of the Crow way of life and the ideals associated with it. After being confined to the reservation, the nomadic life organized around hunting and the warfare necessary to sustain moving borders became impossible. When the previous social roles are no longer available and the associated standards of excellence can no longer legitimately guide a life, agents lose their practical bearings (see, e.g., Lear 2006, 42–43). With the loss of a way of life and the associated ideals, the actions that were once paradigmatic expressions of bravery – planting a coup stick and counting coup, for example – no longer make sense. The significance of even the most mundane

---

[5] Clark 1998, 852. Discussing Heidegger's interpretation of the GS 125, Robert Pippin suggests that Nietzsche and Heidegger "do not treat the crisis of nihilism as primarily an intellectual crisis, a problem of credible belief (although it is clearly also that)" (Pippin 2015, 181).

[6] Charles Taylor has described this shift at length in *A Secular Age*. He describes it as a shift not only from "a condition where most people lived 'naïvely' in a construal (part Christian, part related to 'spirits' of pagan origin) as simple reality, to one in which almost no one is capable of this, but all see their option as one among many. We all learn to navigate between two standpoints: an 'engaged' one in which we live as best we can the reality our standpoint opens to us; and a 'disengaged' one in which we are able to see ourselves as occupying one standpoint among a range of possible ones, with which we have in various ways to coexist" (Taylor 2007, 12).

[7] GA5:222/166–67. The discussion of this phenomenon continues throughout much of "Nietzsche's Word."

of daily activities is altered as the framework within which they gain their significance falls apart. Reflecting on events following this confinement, Plenty Coup, the last great chief of the Crow nation, claims nothing happened (Lear 2006, 2).

Charles Taylor explores this possibility on the level of Western culture in *Sources of the Self* when he compares Luther's crisis prior to his "insight about salvation through faith" to the modern crisis of meaninglessness, the common if sometimes vague question about whether life has meaning or what that meaning is. Luther's crisis was not one of meaninglessness; he was confident about the highest values of his time. He was, however, unsure whether he could live up to them. The crisis of meaninglessness, by contrast, is made possible when "the world loses altogether its spiritual contour, nothing is worth doing, the fear is of a terrifying emptiness, a kind of vertigo" (Taylor 1989, 18).

This type of vertigo, however, does not mean that we will not be able to navigate the world in some sense. Mark Wrathall distinguishes between instrumental importance and existential importance to illuminate the problem posed by this type of nihilism. Instrumental importance depends on the ends or purposes available in the world. If someone chooses to become a doctor, the things and people she encounters in her doctoring activities have instrumental importance. For something to have existential importance, on the other hand, "the object or person or practice is something without which we would cease to be who we are" (Wrathall 2011, 200). With this distinction in place, Wrathall describes one threat posed by the nihilism of the technological age: "in the technological world, because everything presents itself as a mere resource, and thus has at best instrumental importance, nothing is capable of existential importance" (Wrathall 2011, 201). He suggests further that things with instrumental importance may lose their ability to create a sense of PLACE in the way they once did, adding another dimension to the vertigo possible in our contemporary age.

But although temporarily disorienting at both the individual and societal level, Nietzsche thinks the devaluation of the heretofore highest values is not necessarily an overall loss. It is potentially liberating as we "say yes to a new dispensation of value" and "no to the former values" (GA5:223–24/167). Nietzsche's nihilism is two-pronged: it involves not only the devaluation of the hitherto highest values, but also a revaluation of the highest values (GA5:223–24/167, 231–32/187). Nietzsche writes optimistically of the aftermath of the death of God:

> indeed, at hearing the news that "the old god is dead," we philosophers and "free spirits" feel illuminated by a new dawn; our heart overflows with gratitude, amazement, forebodings, expectation – finally the horizon seems clear again, even if not bright; finally our ships may set out again, set out to face any danger; every daring of the lover of knowledge is allowed again; the sea, our sea lies open again; maybe there has never been such an "open sea."[8]

As Nietzsche understands it, the revaluation of all values allows for the overcoming of META-PHYSICS (which crucially depends on a supersensory realm), thereby opening up the possibility for a more abundant life, one which affirms this life and doesn't depend for its value on some supersensory world (GA5:231–32/173, 237/177).

Yet, although Nietzsche sees his philosophy as a counter-movement to the problematic trends of nihilism, Heidegger thinks Nietzsche is no exception to the tendency of counter-movements to remain trapped in the essence (or logic or assumptions) of what they challenge (GA5:217/162, 259/193; see also "Nihilism as Determined by the History of Being,"

---

[8] Nietzsche 2012, §343. Wrathall discusses this passage in Wrathall 2011, 202.

GA6.2:301–61/N4 199–250). As he puts it, "every reversal of this kind will only be a self-blinding entanglement in what is the same though become unrecognizable" (GA5:232/173). The devaluation and revaluation of values depends on the possibility of our ability to posit values, which traces back, on Heidegger's reading of Nietzsche, to the will to POWER. Rather than moving beyond metaphysics, Heidegger thinks Nietzsche's thought becomes the epitome of nihilism, and he becomes the last metaphysician: "Nietzsche's metaphysics is not an overcoming of nihilism. It is the ultimate entanglement in nihilism" (GA6.2:306/N4 203). The origins of these worries could trace back to Nietzsche's own question from *The Gay Science* 125: "must we ourselves not become gods simply to appear worthy of [the act of killing God]?" To re-establish values through our own willing capacity may seem the height of hubris, bracketing the worry of whether we can make something valuable merely by wishing it to be so. Hans Sluga explains it this way: "against Nietzsche, Heidegger argues that we cannot make intrinsically valueless things valuable through an act of human willing" (Sluga 2005, 106). In a similar vein, Pippin writes: "for Heidegger, attempting to fill it [the void left by nihilism] at all, especially by some human self-assertion, is itself an expression of nihilism (a forgetting of our passivity with respect to, dependence on, what could matter)" (Pippin 2015, 195).

But if Heidegger thinks Nietzsche's approach to nihilism is problematic, what does he propose in its place? Framing the problem in Wrathall's terms, Heidegger thinks we need to figure out how to find existentially important things and to develop or re-establish the sense of place diminished or lost in our age. In what remains, I shall briefly discuss two recent accounts of the Heideggerian response to the nihilism of the technological age – Hubert Dreyfus and Sean Kelly's in *All Things Shining* and Wrathall's in "Between the Earth and the Sky."

As Dreyfus and Kelly explain our contemporary situation in *All Things Shining*, the proliferation of choices coupled with the sense that there is no right way to live leads to lives of "hesitation and indecision, culminating in choices finally made on the basis of nothing at all" (Dreyfus and Kelly 2011, 3). The burden of choice, they suggest, "is a distinctly modern phenomenon," one which "proliferates in a world that no longer has any God or gods, nor even any sense of what is sacred and inviolable, to focus our understanding of what we are" (Dreyfus and Kelly 2011, 7). Because a lack of receptivity to the significance of the world is central to contemporary nihilism, we can't force a new understanding of being in the way Heidegger sees Nietzsche doing. The key, as Dreyfus suggests in an earlier essay, is to foster human receptivity and preserve pre-technological practices in the hopes that they may one day help coalesce into a new paradigm (Dreyfus 2006, 366–67). Dreyfus and Kelly analyze various Western classics – from Homer to *Moby Dick* to Dante's *Divine Comedy* to David Foster Wallace's *Infinite Jest* – looking for insights both into the modern problem of meaninglessness and into how we can restore meaning in a nihilistic world. A certain type of engagement with these works of ART can play a crucial role in restoring our sensitivity to the sacred and the various ways and domains in which we can experience the call of the gods. Ultimately, they think, this can bring about a contemporary polytheistic world, one with a polytheism "more varied and more vibrant than anything Homer ever knew" (Dreyfus and Kelly 2011, 223).

In "Between the Earth and the Sky," Wrathall examines "the nature and place of religion in a postmetaphysical, technological world" (Wrathall 2011, 195). In the technological age in which everything becomes a resource, things around us no longer make demands on us in the way they once did. What we need to do, Heidegger thinks, is allow ourselves to be conditioned

by the things around us.[9] Real THINGS, as opposed to mere resources or STANDING RESERVE, can make demands on us and can help create a sense of place and mattering, both of which are impoverished or lost in a robustly nihilistic technological age (Wrathall 2011, 206). As we allow the real things around us to make demands or, put differently, allow ourselves to be conditioned by them, we open ourselves to the possibility, first, of finding things existentially important and, second, of redeveloping a richer sense of place than often prevails in the technological age. Using Heidegger's notion of the FOURFOLD, Wrathall suggests that as we allow the EARTH, sky, divinities, and our own mortality to condition us, we can become receptive to the sacred, which is the experience "of recognizing that there is a kind of intelligibility to the world that we do not ourselves produce" (Wrathall 2011, 209). As this happens, it undermines the logic of TECHNOLOGY because we see certain things as invested with holiness, with an intelligibility inherent to them. The pull and the power of technology are strong, however, and this explains Heidegger's claim from the *Der Spiegel* interview that "only a God can save us." As it turns out, the death of God may open the possibility for a more meaningful sense of the divine. The death of the Christian God, then, poses a real danger but also a great opportunity "to find a relationship to the divine that can endow our lives with deep importance" (Wrathall 2011, 210). We cannot bring this about ourselves, but we can keep the practices alive that can attune us in such a way that we can experience the divine in the world (Wrathall 2011, 211). We can prepare a readiness for the appearance of God (Wrathall 2011, 211; GA16:671/HR 326).

Justin F. White

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA6.2:23–229 ("Der europäische Nihilismus")/N4 1–196; GA67:175–256 ("Das Wesen des Nihilismus")

FURTHER READING

Conway 1992, Thomson 2011a, Wrathall 2004, esp. 4–5, Young 2001

---

[9] It is through ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*) – the process of mutual conditioning between us and the real things around us – that we can dwell in the sense Heidegger discusses in various places. See Wrathall 2011, 204–210; and DWELLING.

142.
NOTHING (*NICHTS*)

THE NOTHING IS that which allows us to grasp and conceptualize what, prior to such conceptualization, remains inchoate and unformed in our phenomenological experience, not yet recognized as a meaningful entity, and in this sense not yet a thing (but rather a "no-thing"), hence (rather naturally in English at least) a "nothing." For Heidegger, "the nothing" does not designate brute non-being; what he calls "the nothing itself" is not nothing at all. In his words, the nothing is not "the *non-being of the null* [*das Nicht-Sein des Nichtigen*], which *is* not at all" (GA36/37:236/181). Such a null or nugatory nothingness would have no force or effect, whereas the phenomenon Heidegger calls "the nothing" actively *does* something: "the nothing itself noths or nihilates" (*Das Nichts selbst nichtet*, GA9:114/90).

Heidegger made that notoriously recondite pronouncement in 1929 and philosophers have disagreed vociferously about what it might mean ever since. It is even no exaggeration to say that, when Heidegger proclaimed that "the nothing itself noths," he thereby gave the Western philosophical tradition the single sentence most responsible for splitting it into its contemporary "continental" and "analytic" branches (Friedman 2000). In effect, Heidegger divided subsequent philosophers into those who found such esoteric utterances at least potentially deep and important (namely, the "continentals") and those like Carnap (the arch-"analytic" logical positivist who attended Heidegger's original lecture), who would go on three years later to ridicule this very sentence as the paradigm example of metaphysics' tendency to produce "entirely meaningless" "pseudo-statements" (Carnap 1959, 61, 69). By "pseudo-statements," Carnap does not mean *false* statements but *non*-statements, that is, statements that do not even qualify as proper "statements," since such meaningless assertions mimic the syntactical structure of ordinary propositions but turn out to be empty of semantic content, owing to their unknowing commitment of basic logical errors, in this case, to Heidegger's alleged hypostatization of the familiar act of negation. Thanks to Carnap, "the nothing itself noths" became the most infamous philosophical example of what Wittgenstein (in another context) famously characterized as "language gone on holiday" from common sense and established usage (Wittgenstein 1958, 19).

Wittgenstein himself understood Heidegger's proclamation more sympathetically (and accurately) as an expression of Heidegger's running "up against the boundaries of language." But Wittgenstein similarly thought that all such efforts to put the extra-linguistic source of linguistic intelligibility into words were doomed "apriori" to "be nonsense" (Waismann 1979; Wittgenstein 1993), at best respectable but futile attempts to say what should instead be passed over in reverent silence. Wittgenstein's own respect for Heidegger's attempt was subsequently silenced, moreover, omitted from the English translation of his remarks (Bell *et al.* 2015), and the "analytics" went on to win the day politically in the English-speaking philosophical world, gaining hegemony over most of its leading academic institutions (Thomson 2012). The deep irony, however, is that the continentals were in the right *philosophically* here. Heidegger's famous assertion that "the nothing itself noths" is not meaningless metaphysical nonsense, pace Carnap

and the still common misreading of Heidegger as an "irrationalist" (refuted by Käufer 2005b, building on Glendinning 2001). As Wittgenstein intimated, "the nothing itself noths" is part of Heidegger's phenomenological attempt both to describe the pre-linguistic source of linguistic and conceptual MEANING and also to characterize the emergence of such meaning. Heidegger worked on this difficult phenomenological project throughout his career, from *Being and Time* to his last public presentation in 1974 (GA15:401–07/FS 93–97), and leading philosophers influenced by the phenomenological tradition still pursue it to this day (see, e.g., Dreyfus and Taylor 2015).

To put it more precisely, Heidegger's succinct, summarizing formulation, "the nothing itself noths," seeks to evoke both (1) that pre-linguistic "origin" (the primal phenomenological source or *Ursprung*) from which all ordinary concepts and established linguistic meanings first arise (namely, "the nothing itself") and also (2) the manner in which this pre-linguistic origin offers itself to LANGUAGE (by actively "noth-ing," so to speak). Heidegger's initially jarring reference to a dynamic "noth-ing" is thus not some illegitimate hypostatization of the act of negation (as Carnap's polemic falsely assumed) but, instead, one of Heidegger's earliest attempts to evoke the way in which what is currently outside linguistic and conceptual intelligibility ("the nothing itself") offers itself to us phenomenologically, allowing us to capture at least some aspects of it in words and CONCEPTS. In 1929, this "noth-ing of the nothing" is thus Heidegger's attempt to express the not-yet-a-thing on its way to becoming a thing. This temporal process of ontological becoming happens (to take the most germane example) when we (world-disclosive DASEIN) conceptually disclose some inchoate phenomenon's hints about its nature (its active "noth-ing"), intimations which are largely preconceptual but still sensibly manifest and so phenomenologically accessible. The linguistic and conceptual innovations whereby we seek poetically to capture aspects of this previously inchoate phenomenon in words can thus serve that phenomenon's coming-into-being (or becoming intelligible), allowing it to become a discrete thing for us by entering into our intelligible worlds in a relatively stable and meaningful way. Taken together, then, "the nothing itself noths" seeks *both* (1) to designate that background of preconceptual but phenomenologically accessible intelligibility ("the nothing itself") from which meaningful words and concepts are first drawn, and also (2) to convey the way our words and concepts can facilitate things' emergence from preconceptual intelligibility into conceptual sense – which, as we will see, is what happens when these words and concepts responsively disclose the nothing's suggestive "noth-ing," its beckoning phenomenological hints about its nature.

Thanks primarily to his subtly yet profoundly transformative engagement with the German Romantic poet Friedrich Hölderlin, the "middle" Heidegger (circa 1929–38) comes to think that human beings first form meaningful words when we responsively conceptualize our preconceptual encounter with that which is not yet an entity. When we do this well, we disclose the beckoning, suggestive hints (or "noth-ing") of the world's preconceptual background intelligibility ("the nothing itself") into words and concepts. We could thus finish Heidegger's famous sentence as follows: "the nothing itself noths" *into meaningful words and concepts – with the help of Dasein's (poietic) acts of world-disclosure*. For, when we pick up on the inchoate hints of some emerging phenomenon and creatively disclose those hints in order to "name" this phenomenon "into being" conceptually (GA4:33–48/51–66), what had previously been nothing (or no thing) for us *becomes* something (or some discretely intelligible thing).

This kind of poetic – or, more precisely, *poietic*, that is, world-disclosive – "naming into being" is accomplished when we attend carefully to and manage to express in words the particular way in which some phenomenologically accessible aspect of the previously unnoticed, background intelligibility – or "nothing" – of our world suddenly "noths" – or shows itself to us as something beckoning to be put into words, calling on us to conceptualize it. "The nothing itself noths" into words and concepts, then, whenever a previously inchoate aspect of this background calls on us to carve it (poetically) into some discrete sense or meaning that then comes to populate and structure our intelligible worlds. For the middle and later (post-1938) Heidegger, this distinctive act of "naming-into-being" makes Dasein essentially a "poietic" (or ontologically maieutic) discloser of being. For, such poietic or disclosive acts are at the heart of all our most meaningful practices, from POETRY and THINKING to ART, architecture, and education. (As that suggests, Heidegger will soon come to see that we disclose the nothing in our embodied practices as well as in our linguistic concepts; see, e.g., "The Origin of the Work of Art" and "Building Dwelling Thinking" in PLT.)

Perhaps the most profound lesson Heidegger first learns from Hölderlin is that such poietic acts of world-disclosure do not merely make *explicit* those relations of preconceptual significance that were already *implicit* in our practical familiarity with our worlds, as 1927's *Being and Time* suggests, famously presenting the view that Dasein's pre-linguistic, practical "significations grow or ripen into words" (SZ 161; but cf. SZ 162). Heidegger implicitly retracts this view seven years later, in his first lectures on Hölderlin (in 1934–35), when he writes: "in language there occurs the revelation of entities, not just a post-facto expression of what is already unveiled" implicitly in our practical engagement with the world (GA39:62). Rather than simply making implicit practical relations of significance explicit conceptually (as we do, for instance, when someone in a workshop tells us that "the hammer hangs over there, on those nails next to the saw"), "poietic" naming-into-being more creatively discloses previously inchoate hints, bringing these hints together in new and suggestive ways that allow us human beings to come to see something where previously we saw nothing – or where, in the case of the poetic disclosers themselves, we previously encountered only the suggestive glimmering (or phenomenological "noth-ing") of that which we had not yet brought at least partly into the focused clarity of our linguistic concepts. To try to put this subtle shift in Heidegger's philosophy of language simply, we might say that he passes from his earlier pragmatic view that language is about making implicit relations explicit, to a later, neo-Romantic and post-expressivist view that language is not just about expressing individual insights but, ultimately, about opening up and preserving an intelligible historical world in which we human beings can meaningfully dwell.

Throughout Heidegger's later work, his crucial examples of this more ontologically disclosive (and literally meaning-full), poietic understanding of language turn – just like the very idea of the noth-ing of the nothing itself – on the crucial idea of learning to discern a subtly dynamic phenomenon in which something as of yet absent is coming-to-presence. (Heidegger's crucial examples all turn on learning to discern "the PRESENCING of presence," *Anwesen des Anwesenheit*, as he famously puts it later – Thomson 2011a – which means learning to recognize something that is not a thing but rather "comes to presence in a coming that presses in upon us," GA39:111.) The great importance of learning this subtle sensitivity to the presencing of that which is not yet a thing is the most fundamental lesson Heidegger learned from Hölderlin, Nietzsche, and van Gogh – all those "touched" thinkers whose descent into madness Romantically vouchsafed their contact with divinity and inspired something in Heidegger in

turn – albeit something only mistakable as mere "irrationalism" by readers whose hermeneutic sensibilities were already blunted by an (in itself understandable) hostility toward Heidegger's views on LOGIC and politics (see Käufer 2005b; Thomson 2012). What Heidegger learned from poetry was to not fear the nothing as an anxiety-inducing sign of death's approach but, instead, to learn to discern and affirm this "nothing of the nothing" as the source of all creative disclosure and new meaning (see GA39:149, 201–02; Thomson and Bodington 2014).

In the famous text on "The Origin of the Work of Art," Heidegger demonstrates how Vincent van Gogh paints "A Pair of Shoes" in a way that shows these shoes stepping forth from "the nothing," disclosively emerging from a background to which they continue to belong (as I have shown in detail elsewhere – see GA5:19/OWA 33–34; Thomson 2011a, chap. 3). In Heidegger's contemporaneous lectures on Hölderlin (in 1934–35), however, the central example of an absence coming to presence is what Heidegger calls Hölderlin's "holy mourning." For Heidegger, to understand "holy mourning" is to understand Western humanity's current relation to God, our relation to God in this age after that "death of God" which Nietzsche announced (as having already happened; Kaufmann 1954, 95–96). Heidegger's crucial idea is that we need to recognize that absence of God Hölderlin calls "God forsakenness" – that is, the nothing of God, the absence (or "abandonment") of any meaningfully unifying God from our modern historical world – not as a null or nugatory nothingness but, instead, as the phenomenologically inconspicuous way in which we learn to "stay faithful to the earth." When Heidegger proclaims that our "godless time is not nothing [at all], but an uprising [or rebellion, *Aufruhr*] of the earth" (GA39:80), he means to suggest not only that the godlessness of modern enlightenment rationality results from the insurrection of modern subjectivism (or the axiomatic modern view of all reality as objects for subjects to master and control rationally). Heidegger also means, more subtly and profoundly, that the absence of God in modernity is *itself* an active nothing, a "noth-ing" we need to learn to recognize as the concealed presencing of the earth.

Here we see Heidegger moving from his earlier language of the "nothing" to his later terminology of "the EARTH," a terminological transition he also makes in his contemporaneous lectures on "The Origin of the Work of Art" (Thomson 2011a, 84–106). This terminological change is not arbitrary but reflects Heidegger's dawning recognition that the word "earth" (beloved by Hölderlin and Nietzsche, Heidegger's central influences at the time) does a better job of communicating the specificity, particularity, and phenomenological texture whereby that which is outside language actively offers itself to our understanding. Unlike that nebulous haze suggested by "the nothing," the texture-riven "earth" better conveys Heidegger's crucial, phenomenologically realist view that there is a genuine source of partly subject-independent meaning to which we Dasein need to learn to respond. Heidegger's 1934–35 vision of "remaining true to the earth" is part of his complex appropriation of the leading lesson of Nietzsche's *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*: "stay faithful to the earth!" (Kaufmann 1954, 125)

But Heidegger will not be satisfied with Nietzsche's naturalistic understanding of the earth as "what is thinkable for humanity, visible for humanity, feelable by humanity" (Kaufmann 1954, 198), a naturalistic ideal of sticking to what is empirically accessible that, ironically, does not prevent Nietzsche himself from "thinking through his own senses to their [rather speculative] consequences" (Kaufmann 1954, 198) by postulating an empirically unprovable and even knowingly *unknowable* (Kaufmann 1954, 339) understanding of the earth and even the very cosmos itself as the product of a competing play of basic forces (which Nietzsche famously terms

"Dionysus" and "Apollo," chaos and order, or, when he names their endless struggle, "will to power"; Kaufmann 1954, 226–27). In other words, Nietzsche's "earth" is not only a Darwinian arena for competing LIFE forces; the earth itself is the expression of a more fundamental "will to power" in the endless dynamism of its ceaseless cosmic becoming (J. Richardson 1996), an eternal *agon* of forces (in an *unknowably* endless play that the early Nietzsche suggests can *never* be accurately captured by any fixed or stable name; Kaufmann 1954, 42–47; Thomson 2011a, chap. 1). Heidegger, as a hermeneutic phenomenologist, understands "the earth" differently, as a temporally dynamic yet still semantically supporting substratum of intelligibility. In 1934–35, Heidegger's "earth" designates an extra-linguistic reality that can meaningfully inform our best words and concepts even as it also inevitably overflows and so exceeds the words we discover to express some of its aspects. In sum, then, Nietzsche thinks "staying faithful to the earth" means sticking to what we can possibly experience and know (even though his own notions of will to POWER and eternal recurrence do not stay true to that dictum), whereas Heidegger takes the slogan to mean that we should faithfully struggle to responsively disclose and patiently unfold the meaningfulness of that source of intelligibility that can be partly experienced but never exhaustively known (Thomson 2004b, 386–88).

The basic difference between Heidegger and *his* Nietzsche (at least) comes from Heidegger's phenomenologically realist intuition that there is something outside language to which language itself needs to and can respond meaningfully. To respond meaningfully is not just to respond creatively (as we do for the early Nietzsche when we legislate names that usefully but illusorily still the stream of becoming). For Heidegger, to disclose (or "world") the earth faithfully is to do so responsively, such that the poets' words do at least some justice to what they disclose or "name into being" (GA4:33–48/51–65). This difference between the early Nietzsche's linguistic idealism and the middle and later Heidegger's plural realism is important for us here because Heidegger's terminological transformation of "the nothing" into "the earth" was driven by his dawning recognition that language needs to be responsive to the "scarcely graspable beckoning" of something beyond it. He will come to believe that language is at its best and most meaningful when it finds creative ways to respond faithfully to something arriving from at least partly beyond the horizon of our present experience. ("Poetizing as founding – as that creating that has no object and that never merely sings about what lies at hand – is always an intimating, a waiting, a seeing come," GA39:257.)

In short, the phenomenological lesson Heidegger ultimately learns from Hölderlin's poetry is to become sensitive to the promise of a more meaningful future that arrives in an event of "ADAPTATION" (or "enowning," *Ereignis*), a momentous and overwhelmingly meaningful event (like falling in love, or becoming the member of a "PEOPLE") that can help unify the subsequent unfolding of our lives if we faithfully disclose the manifold truths toward which this event beckons us (GA39:111). Ontological truth events offer human beings an abundance of hints that exceed the bounds of current sense and so need to be patiently unfolded and responsively disclosed in our subsequent lives, thus giving us an enduring sense of identity. (Group identity is Heidegger's central political preoccupation at this time; it is the focus of his question of what it means to be, or not to be, German; see, e.g., GA39. We must leave Heidegger's troubling and complicated politics aside – but see Thomson 2005, chap. 3; Thomson 2017.) Here we can begin to see how Heidegger's neo-Nietzschean ideal of "staying faithful to the earth" will itself evolve into his neo-Hölderlinian vision of maintaining fidelity to an enduringly meaningful

"event" of ontological truth (Thomson 2016b), the thinking of which emerges from the political maelstrom of 1933–34.

But the earlier and more basic terminological transformation of "the nothing" into "the earth" was also motivated by Heidegger's recognition that his discussion of the nothing had not been well received or understood. While serving as Rector in 1933, Heidegger still bitterly recalls how, after delivering "What Is Metaphysics?" in 1929, "I was indignantly repudiated on every side" (GA36/37:78/62). (That Heidegger feels globally rejected also tells you how widely he wanted to be heard.) Heidegger thinks the widespread rejection he experienced was due primarily to the great importance he had assigned to the disclosive power of the fundamental attunement of profound "anxiety" or dread (*Angst*). This *phenomenological* view was widely misunderstood as suggesting that some individual's morbid and idiosyncratic "personal mood" was being used to disclose universal ontological truths about the "nothing" as the origin of humanity's understanding of being.

Heidegger rejects those criticisms as a misunderstanding of his phenomenology, which he presents as a philosophy of "engagement" that demands the active participation of each individual in the experience under discussion; we must partake in such experiences ourselves in order to be able to affirm or contest the ontological truths these experiences are supposed to disclose. The phenomenological route to the ontological passes *through* the ontic; only by engaging in an experiential encounter with the ontic phenomenon at issue will we be able to discern any ontological structures that the experience might disclose. (On Heidegger's phenomenological method, see Thomson 2013). In short, Heidegger recognizes that his view of how anxiety discloses the nothing was roundly misunderstood, and he explicitly seeks to "*learn*" from that perceived failure of understanding by developing the ontological insights from 1929 in a language that would allow them to be heard better and expressed more fully. Phenomenologically (and politically) engaged "*teaching*" requires such "courage to stand there when the attempt does not succeed," facing up to one's failures "courageously" by learning to make oneself better understood in the future (GA36/37:78–79/62–63). The phenomenological teacher must possess the Lutheran fortitude and martial "courage to stand there" firmly, weathering whatever storms may come, thereby "*learning*" to advance his or her phenomenological views even further in (and into) the future (GA36/37:79/63).

As this rather telling overemphasis on "courage" suggests, and as Heidegger's lectures from the following year (1934–35) confirm, he was worried – during this, his most militaristic, violent, political, and activist period – that his great emphasis on anxiety might be "understood as the helpless trembling of a cowardice that loses its head," instead of being recognized (the way he would have it) as a heroic confrontation with the nothing, indeed, as Heidegger's own daring, vanguardist advance to the very front-lines in the historical collision between being and nothingness, a *Kampf*, ΡOLEMOS, or CONFRONTATION (*Auseinandersetzung*; literally an "altercation") between knowing and the unknown. Eagerly volunteering for reconnaissance missions to the "outermost edge of understanding" (GA39:248), this heroic advance into the nothing allows his 1929 confrontation with anxiety to be rightly "grasped as the metaphysical proximity to what is unconditional [*Unbedingten*, literally "non-thinged," not yet brought into intelligibility as things], a nearness bestowed only to a supreme steadfastness and readiness" (GA39:73). Heidegger's rhetoric is rather obviously compensatory (this was, after all, a man whose psychosomatic anxiety attacks prevented him from taking up the kind of front-line military service he philosophically romanticizes and rhetorically emulates; GA39:73; Thomson 2005, 174–81),

but the deeper point behind the rhetoric remains true and important: Heidegger is indeed pushing *his own understanding of* the boundary between being and nothing ever further into the nothing.

Heidegger is moving beyond his view from *Being and Time*, that "the being of entities can least of all ever be something such that 'behind it' stands 'something else' which does not appear. Behind the phenomena of phenomenology there is essentially nothing [or nothing else, *nichts anderes*]" (SZ 35–36). The later Heidegger's definitive recognition is that there is indeed something else standing behind "the being of entities" – albeit something that is not a thing but (initially) a "nothing." The noth-ing of that which stands beyond the current horizon of intelligibility is what makes it possible for us to conceive and transform our historical understanding of "the being of entities"; this nothing, in short, is Heidegger's first name for that Ur-phenomenon that his later work most often calls "being as such." As he will put it, looking back in 1940:

> what is needed beforehand is a recognition of the "positive" in the "privative" essence of *alêtheia* [that is, ontological truth understood as phenomenological "unconcealment" or "dis-closure"]. This positive [in the privative, that is, the concealed which *enables* unconcealing] is to be previously experienced as the basic characteristic of being as such [*das Sein selbst*]. The need must first break in on us whereby what becomes worthy of questioning is not only entities in their being [that is, the being of entities] but, first of all, being itself[, being in its very difference from metaphysics' understanding of the being of entities – that is, at first, "the nothing"]. (GA9:238/182)

Despite withering attacks from Carnap and others, Heidegger never gave up this difficult notion. Instead, he struggled his whole life to develop this phenomenological insight more clearly and meaningfully, continually seeking new names with which to evoke the way being gives itself which would not hypostatize this giving as if it were a given entity, names such as "noth-ing," "earth," "being as such," "BEYNG" (*Seyn*), the CLEARING (as the OPEN that can be lit-up differently), being written under a "cross-wise striking-through," "the FOURFOLD," "the DIF-FERENCE," "PRESENCING," "the promise," "the same," the "it" of "*es gibt Sein, es gibt Zeit*," and so on. Indeed, I have long argued that Heidegger's recognition that the "noth-ing" of the nothing is the action of being as such, an activity which exceeds and so cannot be explained in terms of the ontological difference between being and entities, is the defining experience at the heart of his so-called "TURN" and the sine qua non of his "later" thought (Thomson 2005). And while Heidegger is far from presenting "the nothing" as the final word on the matter, he never completely abandons this use of the "nothing" as a name for the presencing of being as such, and so will still succinctly tell his students as late as 1969 that: "The noth-ing of the nothing 'is' being" (GA15:361/FS 57). To the end, then, Heidegger still occasionally reaches for that first name he came up with, in 1929, to designate the phenomenological presencing of that which exceeds the ontological difference (which he had previously thought unsurpassable; see Thomson 2015).

Heidegger's tumultuous middle period is marked by the tension between his early and later views, and in the 1929 essay which suggests that "The nothing itself noths," Heidegger is focused not just on the question of how (and from where) *entities* emerge into conceptual intelligibility; he is also focused on the more general question of how (and from where) the sense of being itself (or what it means to "be" in general) first emerges into intelligibility. We thus see Heidegger struggling in the 1930s to move beyond the metaphysical ambitions to which his discussion of the nothing was directly linked in 1929's "What Is Metaphysics," in which he was still pursuing *Being and Time*'s project of disclosing a fundamental ontology or

understanding of the sense of being in general (Thomson 2015). As Heidegger's thinking matures – passing through its tumultuous, pro-Nietzschean, pro-metaphysical, political middle period from the early 1930s (see esp. GA39) – he increasingly emphasizes that, when human beings accomplish this poetic "naming into being" well, we do not merely *impose* concepts we have prefabricated onto the world. At our best, we instead respond to the particular solicitations of the inchoate phenomenon we are seeking to characterize, and what we are seeking to disclose is not nothing at all, but the not-yet-a-thing on its way toward language.

Let me conclude by suggesting that Heidegger may have initially chosen the language of the nothing in part because – like his emphasis on "the MYSTERY" or "the secret" (*das Geheimnis*) which begins in 1934–35 – such language avoids the Wittgensteinian pitfall of trying to say the unsayable. Instead, it draws our attention to the way what is sayable repeatedly emerges from what *remains* unsaid (indeed, from what can *never* be completely or exhaustively said), and so "leaves the unsayable unsaid, and does so in and through its saying" (GA39:119). To hear "the noth-ing of the nothing" in this way is to hear it as Heidegger's would-be *poietic* disclosure of *poietic* disclosure itself – that is, as a thinking of the origins of thinking, one inspired by and running parallel to Hölderlin's poetry about poetry and van Gogh's painting of painting (Thomson 2011a, chap. 3). This lets us see how Heidegger might respond to Wittgenstein's criticism that the origin of language should not be evoked and explored phenomenologically but only passed over in reverent silence. Heidegger believes in the power of reticent silence to speak volumes in the right circumstances, but he also thinks that: "a mystery that is not known in the power of its veiling is no mystery" (GA39:119). In other words, in order to preserve "the mystery" we have to show *that there is* a mystery. To *keep* the secret we have to tell *that* there is a secret by putting part of that secret into words and then showing that there is still and will always be more to this secret – that being can never be completely disclosed, since there is always more to see and say about the phenomenon (especially that ontologically polysemic Ur-phenomenon from which all phenomena emerge). Heidegger thus suggests in the early 1930s that the mystery of the nothing, or the secret of the earth, is not will to power, eternally recurring (as *Zarathustra* suggests); instead, the secret of the earth is "an inexhaustible abundance of simple modes and shapes" (GA5:34/PLT 47) – an apparently inexhaustible source of all that is not-yet, a rich texture of phenomenological hints "in which all emergent happening trembles and remains held" (GA39:107).

To name this mystery "earth" is not to tell the secret or disclose the mystery *once and for all* – which, for Heidegger, is something we finite human beings can *never* do, our "subjectivist" pretensions notwithstanding. As he nicely puts it: "that silence preceding the world is more powerful than all human powers" (GA39:218). That which keeps silent before and beyond language can never be exhaustively expressed, but it still *speaks* powerfully (in its beckoning HINTS), escaping exhaustive saying while giving itself to be said partly in all meaningful disclosure. Pace Wittgenstein's view, then, Heidegger thinks we keep the secret or preserve the mystery best not by staying silent before it but, instead, by sharing it in our own ways, as he himself did by repeatedly innovating multiple, evolving, and overlapping linguistic and poietic inventions, improvisations, and rediscoveries, which – taken as a whole that only begins with the nothing – forthrightly shows the impossibility of ever exhaustively expressing this mystery in words once and for all time. Each of the succinct philosophemes in Heidegger's succession of poietic names for this mysterious source of intelligibility discloses some of its aspects while missing others (and sometimes even occluding them). This explains why Heidegger never

simply rejects his earlier poietic names for the source of intelligibility and its ways of offering itself to our words and practices, just as he does not simply reject "the nothing of the nothing" when he begins referring instead to "the RIFT structure of the earth." He recognized that "the nothing of the nothing" was almost universally misunderstood, and that it risks occluding the real texture of that to which we respond. But we have also seen that "the noth-ing of the nothing" still nicely suggests both (1) that the source of intelligibility is not a thing but should instead be recognized as the not-yet-a-thing on its way to becoming a thing, and also (2) that this "noth-ing of the nothing" calls to us from at least partly beyond the horizon of our current understanding of being – two central later insights that Heidegger never subsequently abandons.[1]

Iain Thomson

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 276–77; GA5:39–40/PLT 53; GA6.2:314–34/N4 210–27; GA9:114–15/90–91, 361–62/274–75; Seubold 1993, 11

NOTION (*VORSTELLUNG*). SEE REPRESENTATION.

NOTION (*BEGRIFF*). SEE CONCEPT.

NULLITY (*NICHTIGKEIT*). SEE NOTHING.

O

143.
OBJECT (*GEGENSTAND*)

A N OBJECT IS something that is characterized by standing a certain distance from a perceiver, thinker, or knower, and that appears to her within a form of apparently self-contained presence, persistence, and stability. Heidegger defines "object" in this way by going back to the literal meaning of the German term *Gegenstand*: "something, that stands (over) against." In this way, such an "ob-ject" "stands out against" the unreflected flux of factical life, the free enactment of DASEIN and THINKING, and the process-related contingency through which WORLD and HISTORY appear. However, Heidegger's leading assumption is that these process- and event-related domains of experience and cognition have to be understood as ontologically primordial in relation to the derivative articulation of persistent being as "objecthood" (*Gegenständlichkeit*), that is, the "character of being an object." What seems to be the most basic form of external or "real" being, the ob-ject in its subject-independent "objecthood," is, in Heidegger's view, itself dependent on a basic operation of objectification of factical experience, an operation that is even prior to the different forms of scientific objectivity.

Gegenstand can, depending on the context, be rendered by "object" or "thing." Note, however, that on at least two occasions Heidegger defines *Objekt* as a spatiotemporal specification of *Gegenstand* (see GA60:35–36; GA9:73/58), whereas *Gegenstand* is taken in the (neo-)Kantian and Husserlian use of the term, as the purely formal ontological category of "something in general" (GA60:36), the "thing in itself" (GA9:73/58). Note also that on some occasions Heidegger relays the fact that the eighteenth-century German neologism *Gegenstand* is a direct translation of the Latin *objectum*, which literally means "what is thrown against," the signification that Heidegger intends by *Gegen-stand*, "what stands over against" (e.g., GA10:120–21/81–82). In this sense, Heidegger uses *Gegenstand* and *Objekt* synonymously "since in an Object something which is thrown over against and brought to the cognizing subject simultaneously stands on its own" (GA10:121/82; cf. also SZ 363).

Because Heidegger thinks that the character of being a spatiotemporal object is closely linked to the modern notion of the SUBJECT, he often employs the term *Objekt* instead of *Gegenstand* in order to stress the intrinsic dependency of objectivity on subjectivity, whereas by *Gegenstand* Heidegger wants to underscore a certain subject-independence of the object. In the latter case, English translations paraphrase *Gegenstand* frequently with "what stands over against" in order to avoid the English alternatives of "object" or "thing." In this respect, one also has to keep in mind that beginning in the 1930s Heidegger distinguishes object from "thing" (*Ding*). The latter refers to a concretely encountered preconceptual entity with manifold contextual implications, which cannot be reduced in any way to the spatiotemporal properties of an *Objekt*, the formal feature of being "something in general," or a "thing in itself," that is, a pure formal placeholder for some specific X. *Gegenstand*, then, is defined as an abstractive specification of the "thing" (GA77:114, 138–40; GA7:162–87/PLT 160–86).

Of greater difficulty still is an adequate translation of the abstract noun *Gegenständlichkeit*, which often is imprecisely rendered by "objectivity." The latter (like its German cognate

Objektivität) primarily designates an epistemic attitude of the scientific perceiver, thinker, or knower, who, in order to be "entirely dedicated to the object" (GA77:42/27), is supposed to exclude subjective feelings and opinions when representing objective properties as verified facts. In contrast, *Gegenständlichkeit* designates only the general "character of being an *object*," its "objecthood," a meaning that is sometimes rendered by the neologism "objectity," even by early Heidegger himself (*Objektität*, e.g., GA60:231–32). Heidegger also frequently uses the unusual term, *Gegenständigkeit* ("objectness," e.g., GA10:118/80), in order to stress even more strongly the objectity-character of being over and against, a terminological peculiarity that is sometimes rendered by "objectness of the object" (GA10:118/80). In the context of Heidegger's ONTOLOGY, the difference between being as objectity and being as objectivity is of some relevance, as it marks a foundational relation in which scientific objectivity is derivative from objectity. Only what stands (over) against and out of the flux of factical life (or, in the terminology of *Being and Time*, the enactment of Dasein), can become the object of *objectification* (*Vergegenständlichung*) and reification (*Verdinglichung/Objektivierung*).

This means that in order to be an object something has to be objectified. More precisely, Heidegger takes the ontological category of "objectity" – and its reality – to be the correlate generated by and encountered in an objectifying attitude that subjects can adopt toward BEING altogether (i.e., toward NATURE, culture, society, LANGUAGE, SCIENCE, cognition, and even toward themselves as subjects). As stable, persistent, independent objects, objective entities can become objects of mathematically informed objectifications, natural or social scientific investigations, or practically oriented technological implementations. Each of these objectifying practices converges, for Heidegger, in the fact that they are articulations of a basically theoretical attitude, in which Heidegger detects a generally reductive and deeply misleading approach to being. Indeed, the whole of Heidegger's philosophical project of a fundamental ontology can be understood as a critique of the "general prevalence of the theoretical" (GA56/57:87) within occidental rationality. This dominance is, as Heidegger later holds, at the origin of the "ABANDONMENT OF BEING" (GA65:141), insofar as this type of rationality reduces all domains of being either to nature or to ideality, and so, in both cases, to "something . . . objectively present" (GA65:323).

In a first major step, Heidegger argues in *Being and Time* that the being that is encountered as "objective presence" in this theoretical attitude (e.g., SZ 71, 361) contrasts with a more immediate and more fundamental form of experiencing things in the horizon of their usefulness, or what he calls the mode of AVAILABLENESS. In this vein, an object that appears as being objectively present has been somehow dissociated from a state in which it is available (literally, "at hand," *zu-handen*) in the context of factical Dasein to a state in which it is OCCURRENT (literally "present before hand," *vor-handen*), and thus appears in the mode of "fore-having" and "fore-sight." From a grammatical or logical point of view, the corresponding operation of objectification is articulated through the apophantic structure of propositional judgment or ASSERTION (*Aussage*) by which something is designated *as* something:

> The being held in fore-having, for example, the hammer, is initially at hand as a useful thing. If this being is the "object" of a proposition, as soon as we begin the proposition, a transformation in the fore-having is already brought about beforehand. Something available with which we have to do or perform something, turns into something "about which" the statement that points it out is made. Fore-sight aims at something objectively present in what is available. (SZ 157–58)

The objective "essence of" such propositional "ᴛʀᴜᴛʜ lies in the 'agreement' of the judgment with its object" (SZ 214). Heidegger contrasts this "traditional concept of truth" (SZ 214) as *adaequatio* of judgment and object with a more fundamental form of pre-objective evidence (see Cʟᴇᴀʀɪɴɢ). Although in *Being and Time* the terms "object" and "objectity" remain largely underdetermined as Heidegger himself admits in the last paragraph (SZ 436–37), it is clear that they belong to a general critique of the "de-vivification" (*Ent-leben*) of "vital experience" (GA56/57:74/59) and the persistent reification of Dasein and its being-in-the-world. And although Heidegger develops a theory of Tɪᴍᴇ here that criticizes the supposedly originary mode of presence and stability of objects (e.g., the mode of *Gegenwärtigung*, "making present," SZ 363), it is only in the 1930s that he turns to a genuine ontology of the object.

In a second step after *Being and Time*, Heidegger's leading assumption is that objectity is only one, although decisive, figure in a longer history of being. In a genealogy of the theoretical attitude and its objective correlates as successive figures within the history of being, Heidegger develops a narrative that starts with the ancient Greek understanding of being as presence (*Anwesenheit*) and develops via Galileo's and Newton's physicalist account of nature, Descartes' conception of *res extensa*, and Leibniz's *mathesis universalis*, to Kant's transcendental conception of the object as a fully quantified and causally informed substantial entity (GA41:1–92/1–54). Indeed, it is Kant who provides, in Heidegger's account of such ʜɪsᴛᴏʀʏ ᴏꜰ ʙᴇɪɴɢ, the final – and problematic – articulation of objectity (see also GA65:89, 93; GA77:98; GA10:112–22/76–82).

In a lecture from 1935, Heidegger differentiates in Kant a "narrow and proper sense" of the object and a "wider and improper sense" (GA41:143/141): "The object proper is only what is represented in experience as experienced. The improper object is every thing [*jegliches Etwas*, literally: "every something," my addendum] to which a representation as such refers – be it intuition or thought" (GA41:144/141). Whereas the improper object is either a pure ideal or conceptual content ("what we have merely thought as such," GA41:144/141) or a pure material content ("what is only given in perception and sensation," GA41:144/141), the object proper is the synthetic unity of both. By this Kant means the conceptually informed given intuitive content, that is, in the Kantian sense, the object of an experiential judgment determined by the categorical laws of extensive and intensive quantifications and, above all, by the rule of consequence, that is, the concept of causality: "Now an object [*Gegen-stand*] is grasped. . . . The relation is now that of 'if . . . then,' ('because . . . therefore'). . . . This relation is now posited as necessary. What this judgment says is valid at all times and for everyone; it is not subjective but true . . . of the object [*Gegenstand*] as such" (GA41:141/138–39). In other words, an object proper is something represented with necessary, universal, and inter-subjectively valid qualities, which, can be quantified and understood within causal relations. In contrast, Heidegger objects that Kant "does not inquire into and determine in its own essence that which encounters us prior to an objectification [*Vergegenständlichung*] into an object of experience [*Erfahrungsgegenstand*, my addendum]" (GA41:144/141).

What for Heidegger is prior to such objectification can be summed up as follows: (a) the thing that is encountered in a pre-objective mode; (b) the self-constitution of subjectivity as a condition of possibility of objectity; and (c) a specific history of being within which objectity is only one possible figure of being. With (c) Heidegger calls into question the apparently timeless character not only of the a priori conceptual structures expressing epistemological necessity as the constitutive features generated by (b), but also of a given perceivable material content, which is already an abstraction of (a). More precisely, Heidegger aims to demonstrate that objectity is by no means an ontologically neutral category, but already an articulation of

a specific form of subjectivity as "representational rationality" (e.g., GA7:183/PLT 179; cf. also GA77:111). Playing on the literal meaning of REPRESENTATION, Heidegger states: "Re-present [*Vor-stellen*] means to put something before oneself and to have it before one, as the subject so have something present toward oneself and back onto oneself [*etwas auf sich als das Subjekt zu, auf sich zurück, präsent haben: re-presentare*]" (GA41:139/136). What disappears within the "dis-tance" (*Ab-stand*) of "representation" (GA65:136) is the immediate experience of things (and of the self, too) in their pre-objective, lively and eventful character.

Elsewhere, Heidegger goes one step further in his genealogy of objectity, pointing to a direct foundational relation between object (*Gegen-stand*) and resource or STANDING RESERVE (*Be-stand*, GA7:17/BW 322) for technologically informed procedures of production. The character of being merely "standing reserve" is thus a further specification of the object in its intrinsic affinity to calculability, the condition of possibility for the technological INVEN-TORY (*Ge-Stell*) of being (GA7:20/BW 324). The critique of the domination by theoretical thinking thus leads to a critique of technological domination and destruction of nature, in which nature becomes a resource in the technological INVENTORY (see TECHNOLOGY; see also SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT(ION)ING). More recently, the BLACK NOTEBOOKS have revealed that Heidegger connects his critique of technological "machination" (GA65:127; GA96:56) with anti-Semitic convictions, identifying his diagnosis of the mathematical affinity of modern rationality – and the destructive force in such orientation – with the stereotype of an alleged "special Jewish aptitude for calculation" (GA96:56).

David Espinet

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Object, objectity (*Gegenstand, Gegenständlichkeit*) SZ 156–59, 231–32, 361–66, 375, 419; GA:3, 25, 28–35, 121–23; GA5:26ff./19ff., 65ff./49ff., 75–113/57–85; GA7:19, 42ff./QCT 18, 158ff.; GA10:50/32, 53/35; GA17:14, 207–12; GA20:1, 82–99, 263–69; GA21:94, 115, 159, 323; GA24:285–88; GA58:122–35; GA60:30, 57, 61, 307, 316–18, 328; GA77:3, 4, 10–17, 36, 87–88, 90–91, 98, 111–14, 128, 133
Ob-ject (*Gegen-stand*) GA5:108/82; GA7:45/QCT 162; GA8:237/234; GA9:463–64/350–51; GA10:49/32, 51/33
Objectification (*Vergegenständlichung*) GA5:83/63, 109–10/82–84, 150/112, 192/144, 255–57/191–92, 288–99/216–17, 303–05/227–29; GA7:52ff./QCT 169ff.; GA8:140/135; GA77:12, 17, 127–28, 157
Objectness (*Gegenständigkeit*) GA7:45ff./QCT 162ff.; GA8:238/234, 242/238, 246/243; GA9:349/265, 463–64/351–52, 467ff./353ff.; GA10:82–83/55, 114ff./77ff.

FURTHER READING

Carman 2003, 155–203, Carr 2007, Figal 2010a, 1–29, 107–20, Haugeland 2013, 167–78, McManus 2012, 51–75

144.
OBJECT (*OBJEKT*)

Object (objekt) is a technical term, and refers to objects, insofar as they are thought of as occurrent (*vorhanden*) entities next to an occurrent subject. *Objekt* is one of two words Heidegger frequently uses that are properly translated into English as *object* – the other is *Gegenstand* (see Object [Gegenstand]). Heidegger primarily uses *Objekt* when discussing and critiquing the subject–object distinction he takes to be central to the thought of other philosophers, especially Husserl, Descartes, and Kant. *Gegenstand* is used in a much wider variety of contexts (see, e.g., GA60:35–36; GA25:203–04), and can sometimes denote objects, as they are phenomenologically given to us. Some English translations of works where this conceptual distinction is especially important, such as GA25 (*Phenomenological Interpretation of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason*), preserve it by using different words to translate *Objekt* and *Gegenstand*. This is not, however, a universal practice.

Heidegger often remarks that the sciences (such as, for instance, chemistry, mathematics, botany, and even theology) "objectify" the entities they study, and in so doing, view said entities simply as *Objekte*. For instance, in *Being and Time*, he notes that the "thematizing" (*Thematisierung*) endemic to scientific inquiry aims to "free the entities we encounter within-the-world, and to free them in such a way that they can "throw themselves" against a pure discovering – that is, that they can become "objects" (SZ 363). This mode of encountering entities might be useful to practitioners of science, but does not necessarily capture the full range of interactions we have with entities in everyday experience. In his 1964 postscript to "Phenomenology and Theology," Heidegger discusses aesthetic and religious experiences where we relate to an entity without objectifying it. When we admire the beauty of a blossoming rose or a statue of Apollo, we do not view those entities as occurrent objects of scientific inquiry; we instead relate to them as things in the world with an inherent significance. This leads Heidegger to conclude that "our everyday experience of things, in the wider sense of the world" does *not* involve the sort of objectification characteristic of the sciences (GA9:75–76/57–58).

If we view the world as comprised exclusively of objects that can be studied by the sciences, Heidegger thinks we run into a major problem: it is unclear how we can get "outside ourselves" to gain knowledge of those objects in the first place. He dubs this the "problem of transcendence" and thinks it can be resolved by viewing the self and its surrounding world as a unified whole. We are, for Heidegger, *part* of the world that contains the "objects" of scientific inquiry. As he states, "self and world are not two entities, like subject and object … but self and world are the basic determination of the Dasein itself in the unity of the structure of being-in-the-world" (GA24:422). Heidegger thus claims that the world that we experience, understand, and participate in, is "'more Objective' than any possible 'Object'" (SZ 366; GA24:424) since it conditions our initial understanding of scientific objectivity and objectification.

By Heidegger's lights, many major philosophers buy into a faulty picture of the relation between subjects and objects and, in so doing, fall victim to the problem of transcendence. For instance, Husserl's theory of intentionality "designates a relation of the subject to the object" while also maintaining that intentionality "belongs to the subjective sphere" (GA24:86).

However, if intentionality is truly as "subjective" as Husserl seems to claim it is, there is no clear way for the subject to get "outside" his or her own representations and make contact with objects in the "real world," since those objects can only correspond to our internal representations of objects. This leads Heidegger to view intentionality as neither strictly "subjective" nor strictly "objective," but rather as something built into the structure of our everyday interactions with entities in the world, such as hammers, windows, and chalkboards.

Kant's theory of categories is also plagued by the problem of transcendence, according to Heidegger. In the *Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant claims that his system of categories grounds and conditions our ability to view things as objects, which he attempts to prove in the Transcendental Deduction. As Heidegger notes, this creates a problem: "although [the categories] are not present (*vorhanden*) in the object, still they are supposed to determine objects, to be 'applicable' to objects; they raise a claim to ob-jective validity" (GA25 314). How, though, can categories that are only occurrent in a subject "reach out" and determine objects that are entirely "outside" the subject? Again, Heidegger thinks this problem speaks to a deficiency in Kant's conception of the relation between subjects and objects. Kant "[fails] to see transcendence as an original and essential determination of the ontological constitution of Dasein" (GA25:315) and thus runs into an insoluble paradox.

Heidegger's use of *Objektivität*, which is usually translated as "objectivity," closely mirrors his use of *Objekt*. He generally uses the word to denote the capacity to take up a certain perspective that treats the entities it encounters as *Objekte*. For example, Heidegger claims that Descartes, Leibniz, and other rationalist philosophers misunderstand the phenomenon of worldhood due to their commitment to a view in which "the being of the world is nothing other than the objectivity of the apprehension of nature through calculative measurement" (GA20:245).

The meaning of *Objektität*, which is usually translated as "objectity," is a bit trickier to parse out. In his 1920 lectures on the phenomenology of religion, Heidegger links objectity to religious self-concern, which involves "positing to oneself … an 'objectity' in the face of which that of the 'generality' [of non-individualistic concern] is mere playfulness" (GA60:241). This presumably involves taking oneself as an object of concern, although it's not clear that in so doing, one becomes an occurrent *Objekt* to oneself.

Sam Richards

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Objekt vs. *Gegenstand* GA9:73/58; GA21 331, 333, 405; GA25:203–04; GA60:35–36; GA79:40
Objekt and the sciences SZ 363; GA9:72–74/57–59; GA20:2, 155
The Subject–*Objekt* distinction SZ 176, 179, 192, 204, 360, 366, 388, 392, 419; GA20:215–17, 327; GA24:236, 311, 319–20, 422, 424–25; GA25:319–21
Objekt and intentionality GA20:131–32; GA24:83–88
Objekt and judgment SZ 156; GA20:105–06; GA21:81; GA24:285
Kant's use of *Objekt* SZ 204, 419; GA3:33–34, 188; GA20:100; GA21:202, 297, 331, 333, 405; GA24:49, 61–64, 318–20; GA25:155–58, 203–04, 240–41, 310–15, 319–21
Objektivität GA20:88–89, 245, 270–71; GA21:81; GA24:285
Objektität GA60:241

FURTHER READING

Carman 2003, 101–54

OBJECTIVE PRESENCE (*VORHANDENHEIT*). SEE OCCURRENTNESS.

OBLIVION OF BEING (*SEINSVERGESSENHEIT*). SEE FORGETFULNESS OF BEING.

OCCUPATION (*UMGANG*). SEE COPING.

OCCURRENT, THE (*DAS VORHANDENE*). SEE OCCURRENTNESS.

145.
OCCURRENTNESS (*VORHANDENHEIT*)

OCCURRENTNESS DESIGNATES ONE of three categories or ways of being that Heidegger deploys in *Being and Time* to refer to that which simply is or exists, devoid of context or practical significance (in contrast with AVAILABLENESS, *Zuhandenheit*) or self-understanding (in contrast with DASEIN). Translations of this term vary considerably: Macquarrie and Robinson translate the term as "presence-at-hand" in their edition of *Being and Time*, while Stambaugh uses "objective presence." In his translation of GA20, Kisiel translates *vorhanden* as, variously, "on hand" and "extant," but also "available," "present," and "existent," while Hofstadter uses both "extant" and "present at hand," among others, in his translation of GA24. Dreyfus (1991) and others use an entirely different term, ""occurrentness (and "occurrent" for *vorhanden*), and this is the translation that is used throughout this Lexicon. As with their translation of *Zuhandenheit* as "readiness-to-hand," the Macquarrie and Robinson translation preserves the reference to *hands*. That which is *vorhanden* is there before us – present – but not so as to be *to* or *on* hand, as is the case of EQUIPMENT (that which is *available*). This sense of just being there and no more is what other translations try to capture.

Heidegger deploys the term as early as the second section of *Being and Time*, as part of a list of ways of explicating the notion of BEING: "being lies in the fact that something is, and in its being as it is; in REALITY; in occurrentness; in subsistence; in validity; in Dasein; in the 'there is'" (SZ 7). As simply part of a list, the term appears here without any kind of definition or explanation. Heidegger sometimes uses occurrentness in a generic sense to signify what is in a general, undifferentiated way. For example, in the GA29/30 lectures, Heidegger at one point writes of the way "the entities that surround us are *uniformly present* [*offenbar*] as simply *something occurrent in the broadest sense* – the presence [*Vorkommen*] of land and sea, the mountains and forests, and within this the presence of animals and plants and the presence of human beings and the products of human work, and amongst all this the presence of ourselves as well" and refers to this as the "character of entities as simply occurrent in the broadest sense" (GA29/30:399).[1]

Despite this kind of generic use, in *Being and Time*, Heidegger uses the term primarily in a more restricted way, as can be seen when he distinguishes the sense of "in" of one thing being inside another from Dasein as BEING-IN-THE-WORLD:

> being-occurrent "in" something which is likewise occurrent, and being-occurrent-along-with in the sense of a definite location-relationship with something else which has the same kind of being, are ontological characteristics which we call "*categorial*": they are of such a sort as to belong to entities whose kind of being is not of the character of Dasein. (SZ 54)

The importance of this more restricted, distinctive notion of occurrentness is signaled in the second Introduction to *Being and Time*:

---

[1] I am indebted to Fell (1992) for drawing these passages from GA29/30 to my attention.

λέγειν itself – or rather *νοεῖν*, that simple awareness of something occurrent in its sheer occurrentness, which Parmenides had already taken to guide him in his own interpretation of being – has the temporal structure of a pure "making-present" [*Gegenwärtigens*] of something. Those entities which show themselves in this and for it, and which are understood as entities in the most authentic sense, thus get interpreted with regard to the present; that is, they are conceived as presence [*Anwesenheit*] (*οὐσία*). (SZ 25–26)

What I am calling a more restricted, distinctive use is not unrelated to the generic use mentioned above. We might say that the generic use helps to account for the more restricted notion: because everything can in a sense be regarded as "uniformly present," it is not surprising that philosophers in particular have seized upon occurrentness as somehow fundamental.

Further attention to the last passage cited offers several clues about both the meaning and significance of the term within Heidegger's overall project in *Being and Time*:

(i) The notion of *occurrentness* has figured centrally in philosophical attempts to articulate the meaning of being from the time of the pre-Socratics onward.

(ii) In such attempts, what is *occurrent* is understood as entities "in the most authentic sense," as what there most genuinely is.

(iii) What is *occurrent* has thus been accorded a kind of ontological or metaphysical *primacy* or *priority* in relation to any and all other ways of making sense of things.

(iv) Understanding being – what there is – primarily in terms of *occurrentness* is bound up with a particular – and for Heidegger problematic – way of understanding TEMPORALITY and temporal structure, where the *present* and *making-present* take the lead.

As Heidegger notes later in the text, the primacy of what is occurrent has been taken for granted for so long that it is difficult even to question it:

Yet because occurrentness has been equated with the SENSE of being in general, the question of whether this kind of being of truth is a primordial one, and whether there is anything primordial in that structure of it which we encounter as closest to us, *cannot* come alive at all. (SZ 225)

One of Heidegger's principal aims in *Being and Time* is to bring this kind of question to life. His doing so is especially evident in the early chapters of Division 1, wherein he demonstrates the *derivative* and *deficient* character of the kind of understanding correlative with what is occurrent. Heidegger's phenomenology of EVERYDAYNESS depicts our ordinary understanding as making sense of things primarily as *available*, as, that is, a constellation of referentially interrelated items of EQUIPMENT (see REFERENCE). What is occurrent is only revealed secondarily: "to lay bare what is just occurrent and no more, cognition must first penetrate *beyond* what is available in our concern" (SZ 71). For Heidegger, various kinds of *breakdown* in our everyday circumspective concern serve to reveal what is occurrent: when equipment becomes *un*available, in some way missing, conspicuous, or obstinate, the occurrent can be revealed: "the helpless way in which we stand before [what is unavailable] is a deficient mode of concern, and as such uncovers the being-just-occurrent-and-no-more of something available" (SZ 73).

Heidegger's phrasing here suggests that understanding something as occurrent rather than available is just that, a different way of looking at one and the same *entity*. There is something odd about this suggestion since what is at issue are categorically disjoint *ways of being*, so that one and the same thing cannot *be* both available and occurrent (a horse, for example, can *be* both a horse and a mammal, but that is because one category is nested within the other). Despite the oddness of the suggestion, some of what Heidegger says only seems to underscore it:

> Why is it that what we are talking about – the heavy hammer – shows itself differently when our way of talking is thus modified? Not because we are keeping our distance from manipulation, nor because we are just looking *away* from the equipmental character of this entity, but rather because we are looking *at* the available thing, which we encounter, and looking at it "in a new way" as something occurrent. The *understanding of being* by which our concernful dealings with entities within-the-world have been guided *has changed over*. (SZ 361)

That Heidegger here describes the transformation in terms of the hammer showing itself differently and our seeing it "in a new way" would appear to play into just the kind of view Heidegger elsewhere vehemently opposes, namely, that encountering what is available "is not to be understood merely as a way of taking them, as if we were talking such 'aspects' into the 'entities' which proximally encounter, or as if some world-stuff which is proximally occurrent in itself were 'given subjective colouring' in this way" (SZ 71). What is needed here, but which Heidegger does not provide, is an account of how what is available and what is occurrent can *coincide*, but without being *identical*. They coincide in that they are in the same place at the same time, so that we do not *look* anywhere else to see one rather than another, but in seeing one rather than the other, we are seeing things whose *identity conditions* diverge. To *be* a hammer is to be an entity referentially embedded in a broader array of equipment and activities, whereas the occurrent entity that is revealed when we look at the hammer in a new way is insensitive to any such embedding. One way to think about this notion of coinciding without identity is to contrast what is available with whatever it is that materially composes it. The latter is presumably the job of physics to determine, which accords with Heidegger's linkage of the revelation of the occurrent to the possibility of the natural sciences (see SZ §69b).

If what is available is in some sense made out of what is occurrent, then, as various commentators have pointed out, considerable care is needed in sorting out how one category might have priority over the other (see especially Fell 1992 and Brandom 2002b). As the early chapters of Division 1 of *Being and Time* discussed above indicate, Heidegger wants to insist on a kind of *ontological* priority of the available over the occurrent. Such insistence is crucial for Heidegger's project of "destroying the history of ontology," wherein the idea of the occurrent has been dominant. At the same time, Heidegger can allow a certain legitimacy for the idea that "only by reason of something occurrent, 'is there' something available" (SZ 71). Even "granting this thesis for the nonce," it does not follow that "availableness is ontologically founded on occurrentness." Although Heidegger here only seems to grant the thesis for the sake of argument, nothing elsewhere suggests that he takes it back. Indeed, what he says later in his discussion of ANXIETY reinforces such a thesis:

> Anxiety is anxious in the face of the "NOTHING" of the world; but this does not mean that in anxiety we experience something like the absence of what is occurrent

within-the-world. The occurrent must be encountered in just *such* a way that it does *not* have *any* AFFORDANCE *whatsoever*, but can show itself in an empty mercilessness. (SZ 343)[2]

Here, what is occurrent is encountered as a kind of brute and "merciless" reality, devoid of any of the kind of sense or significance that marks our familiar, everyday ways of doing things. Moreover, this way of encountering what is occurrent would appear to involve a sense of its having been there all along, even if behind the scenes. There may appear to be a difficulty in reconciling the manifestation of what is occurrent in this "merciless" way with encountering what is occurrent in a manner that is amenable to scientific practice. What Heidegger describes in relation to anxiety would seem to accord better with (and perhaps be the inspiration for) Sartre's later descriptions of *nausea*, as well as Lacan's notion of the Real, neither of which is especially conducive to scientific schematization, as both involve a barely articulable sense of what is as just there and no more. For his part, however, Heidegger may not see any difficulty at all. In the GA20 lectures, he explicitly connects the notion of scientific *explanation* with the absence of *comprehension*:

> Every explanation, when we speak of an explanation of nature, is distinguished by its involvement in the *incomprehensible*. It can be stated flatly that *explanation is the expository interpretation of the incomprehensible*, not so that this exposition would let us comprehend the incomprehensible, for it remains incomprehensible in principle. NATURE *is what is in principle explainable and to be explained* because it is in principle incomprehensible. It is *the incomprehensible pure and simple*. (GA20:298)

While this appeal to incomprehensibility suggests a convergence between the more scientific notion of occurrentness and what we confront in anxiety in its "mercilessness," it is still not clear how even the notion of *explanation* can be applicable to both.

David R. Cerbone

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA22:171–74; GA23:20–24, 35–37; GA24:231–33, 426–34, 438–43

FURTHER READING

Cerbone 1999, McManus 2012

ON-THE-BASIS-OF-WHICH (*WORAUFHIN*). SEE IN-TERMS-OF-WHICH.

ONE, THE (*DAS MAN*). SEE ANYONE, THE.

---

[2] See Fell 1992, 68–71 for further discussion of anxiety in relation to occurrentness.

146.
ONTIC (*ONTISCH*)

THE ONTIC CONCERNS concrete properties and characteristics of an entity, in contrast to the ontological which pertains to the specific *way* an entity of a certain kind *has* its characteristics. The early to mid Heidegger centrally distinguishes between the ontic (*ontisch*) and the ontological (*ontologisch*), as his foundational move is to keep entities (*Seiendes*) conceptually distinct from BEING (*Sein*). The adjective "ontological" concerns being – i.e., what it is for a given entity or class of entities *to be* – in distinction to the adjective "ontic," which applies to entities as such, i.e., their properties, their various arrangements and behaviors, whatever can be known empirically about them. When it comes to understanding the basic contours that delimit the possible ways for an entity of a certain kind to be, we are concerned with the *ontological constitution* of entities of this kind; when it comes to matters of this or that entity's concrete condition and properties, we're in the realm of the ontic. Thus, while physical objects, animals, and human beings are all entities, the ways in which they have characteristics – and accordingly the specific nature of their respective characteristics – differ fundamentally: physical objects are OCCURRENT (*vorhanden*), animals *live*, Dasein *exists*. These terms indicate different ontological constitutions, each of which delineates a range of how entities of the respective types can be at all. Not seeing this is a major source of error in philosophy, as one is then prone to throw together categorically distinct conditions based on mere surface resemblances.

In the phase leading up to *Being and Time* and a few years after its publication, the so-called "ontological DIFFERENCE" (GA24:454) – the distinction between entities and being, which might as well be glossed as the ontic/ontological difference (cf. Haugeland 2013, 54) – is at the foundation of Heidegger's thought (see ONTOLOGY). Philosophy's sole task, according to Heidegger, is to come to terms with being, i.e., ontology. Thus, what philosophy proper deals with has to be kept separate from ontic affairs, which are dealt with in all of everyday life, in science, and in all other academic fields aside from philosophy. From the mid-1920s onward, it is an always recurring foundational maneuver of Heidegger's thought to elucidate this focal difference, in order to ensure that ontological matters are not conflated with ontic ones (see, e.g., GA24:452–55). However, given that being is always and necessarily the being of entities, ontic matters – what Heidegger also calls "ontic concretions" (e.g., SZ 78) – are the stepping stone necessary for reaching ontological ones, and so the ontic and the ontological are closely entwined (not least within the being constitution of Dasein itself; more on that below). This means that philosophy will have to perpetually skate along the abyss of a possible conflation of the ontic with the ontological in order to be possible at all (with Heidegger's later philosophy in mind, one might even quip that philosophy *is* the life of this very conflation). That is why philosophy is so hard; and it is also why so much effort in philosophy has to be critical – or, in Heidegger's parlance: *destructive* – as it is vital to be constantly on guard against a characteristic, deep-seated yet all too natural type of mistake: when merely ontic considerations or ontic insights spring up in the place of ontological ones.

This also guides the structure of the present entry. I will first explicate Heidegger's usage of "ontic" with regard to its most critical instance, namely Dasein, the being that is *ontically* such as *to be ontological*. Having seen the ontological difference in action in this exceptional entity, we are then better equipped to discuss examples for how (as Heidegger thinks) conflations of the ontic with the ontological can lead philosophical inquiry astray. The entry closes with brief remarks on why Heidegger in his later works abandoned the terms *ontic*, *ontological* and *ontological difference*. As the pair ontic/ontological figures most prominently in the *Being and Time* phase of Heidegger's work, most of what follows relates exclusively to this book.

Dasein is an entity for which the ontological difference is itself constitutive – its being is such that being is an issue for it, thus, Dasein is the entity that *is such* that it "understands being" (see Dasein). Heidegger puts this such that "Dasein is *ontically* distinctive in that it is *ontological*" (SZ 12). Practically, this means that whenever Dasein exists (which is an ontic affair – a matter of this or that instance of Dasein's concrete life), it thereby embodies or "lives" an understanding of being, i.e., ontological matters are alive and manifest in the ontic concretion of Dasein (my life, your life, etc.). For the most part, this ontological understanding on the part of Dasein unfolds in an inexplicit and unacknowledged way, so Heidegger calls it "pre-ontological." However, it can be made explicit – that is what philosophy, properly construed, does. And so Dasein's pre-ontological understanding of being (*Seinsverständnis*) provides the source and foundation for the ontological understanding that philosophy is essentially after. On the other hand, Dasein's concrete faring in the world, matters of our specific lives, enabled and guided though they are by pre-ontological understanding of being, are strictly ontic affairs – "the warp and weft of all our days" (Haugeland 2013, 54). Heidegger distinguishes these ontic-existentiell (*ontisch-existenziell*) matters from those ontological-existential (*ontologisch-existenzial*) issues that philosophy deals with (see Existential/Existentiell).

> Only the particular Dasein decides its existence, whether it does so by taking hold or by neglecting. The question of existence never gets straightened out except through existing itself. The understanding of itself that leads along this way we call "existentiell." The question of existence is one of Dasein's ontical "affairs." This does not require that the ontological structure of existence should be theoretically transparent. (SZ 12)

But this also means that the *doing* of philosophy, the existential analytic itself, is *ontically* anchored ("*existenziell, d.h. ontisch verwurzelt,*" SZ 13) in the philosopher's own existence. Some individuals have to *existentially commit* to doing philosophy, and only by virtue of – enabled by – this concrete ontic act and attitude is ontology itself possible. That is why Heidegger speaks of an *ontical priority* of the being question (SZ §4; cf. also GA24:26).

Now let us briefly consider two instances of the difference between ontic and ontological in Heidegger's work, and how he thinks its disregard leads to characteristic errors in philosophy. First, consider EQUIPMENT (*Zeug*). In its ontical employment, the term "equipment" refers to all and everything we make use of in going about our daily business: our tools – all sorts of items that have an instrumental functionality. So equipment encompasses everything from tables, chairs, pens and paper, cars and bikes, doorknobs and whatever is available in our workshops and workplaces, kitchens, offices, and so on. Now, a characteristic philosophical mistake in this vicinity is to subsume items of equipment under the category of "physical object" and consider them as a specific class of material things with physical characteristics. But this would be to

entirely miss the ontological constitution of equipment; and due to theoretical prejudice we tend to make this mistake even though we are so utterly familiar with the *ontological* nature of equipment in our routine use of tools (i.e., while we grasp the being-character of equipment *pre-ontologically*, we tend to fail to get it right in our attempt at an explicit ontological under-standing). What "is" equipment when we use it? Exactly not something that is merely physically occurrent in front of us (*vorhanden*), but something that is AVAILABLE and *useful for* . . . whatever we are currently busy with. Thus, equipment's ontological constitution is that of availableness (*Zuhandenheit*) and usefulness for or AFFORDANCE (*Bewandtnis*) (SZ 69, 84f.). Both terms capture the relational dynamics of the way equipment is, on the one hand, tailor-made for its human users (available) and, on the other hand, geared into the teleological nexus of purposeful dealings and strivings that make up the human world at large (affordance as figuring in the "worldliness" – i.e., meaningfulness – of the world). Capturing the ontic concretion of equip-ment properly would thus be to describe items of equipment in terms of their practical usefulness, with regard to their respective place within a local equipmental nexus, and concern-ing features of their concrete usability-in-context (i.e., whether they are "good for" doing this, or "not so good for" doing that, etc.).

The second example concerns the sociality of Dasein, what Heidegger glosses as "BEING-WITH" (*Mitsein*). Ontically, we humans obviously exist socially; i.e., we live together with others, we interact, are concerned with one another, we love, adore, are friends with fellow individuals, but also despise, get annoyed with, or deliberately ignore others – in short, we perpetually stand in all sorts of close and not-so-close social relations and these are fundamental to what we are individually and collectively and how we go about our lives. The characteristic mistake in this vicinity stems from focusing on specific "relations" an individual entertains to other people and then inquiring into the nature of such a relatedness between *ego* and *alter ego*. Usually, one will then come up with a specific type of comportment that is said to be capable of "bridging the gap" between one subject and another: some mental operation such as empathy (*Einfühlung*). Heidegger's general dismissal of this way of construing the matter is another object lesson in his employment of the ontic/ontological distinction.

Because he thinks the error is again that of assuming from the outset a mistaken ontology (in this case: of Dasein and its world), the task as he sees it is to change the framing of the entire issue from the get-go. Instead of assuming two already constituted individuals (or "minds") that then decide to enter into an interpersonal relation, one has to construe BEING-IN-THE-WORLD essentially and from the outset as *being-with*. This means that even the basic relevance relations that constitute the world as a nexus of affordances (*Bewandtniszusammenhang*), even where these pertain to things as mundane as chairs and tables, fork and knife, pen and paper, are such as to be *for and of others* as well as for and of oneself (cf. SZ §26). Significance is not anchored in *individual* Dasein, but in Dasein insofar it is co-existing (*Mitdasein*). This does not mean that there are *also* others beside myself, but: "[the others] are rather those from whom, for the most part, one does *not* distinguish oneself – those among whom one is too"; and thus: "By reason of this with-like [*mithaften*] being-in-the-world, the world is always one that I share with others. The world of Dasein is a with-world [*Mitwelt*]" (SZ 118). Dasein's fundamental ways of *being-together* (*Miteinandersein*) are build on the entire nexus of meaningful relations that make up the world, so that others are *always already* encountered within everything we practically deal with. Only against the backdrop of this default, ubiquitous, and constitutive sociality do pronounced modes of commerce between self and other – such as caring-for (*Fürsorge*) – take shape (SZ 121).

While one might take issue with this specific account of Dasein's default sociality – which might strike one as *too basic*, as it were, so that it can seem hard to find a substantive role for the other *as other* in it – it is clear enough for the purpose of elucidating in a concrete instance how Heidegger understands the difference between the ontic and the ontological. The different ways in which we do in fact relate to others (ontic) presuppose for their intelligibility a construal of Dasein's sociality as such (ontological). It makes all the difference whether we assume mutually insulated "minds" in need of a specific channel of interaction (such as "empathy"), or whether we construe Dasein as from the outset enmeshed in co-habituated realms of shared significance, so that sociality transpires inevitably all the time, everywhere in the human world, and that it is the more emphatic manifestations of *individuality* that stand in need of a special explication.

The main point about the relationship between an ontic and an ontological dimension of inquiry can be put into a deceptively simple slogan (cf. Haugeland 2000): *to know* something (ontic comportment) presupposes *understanding* it (ontological comportment). While the first gets at specific mundane things or phenomena (in our examples: everyday equipment and forms of interpersonal relatedness), the second rather trades in categories or existentiales – basic notions that pertain to the being-constitution of the respective domains at issue. But because of the pre-ontological understanding of being that Dasein possesses, we are usually not ontologically ignorant even if we lack explicit ontological understanding. Much rather, it is philosophers (and scientists) who are at risk of getting things truly and utterly wrong. This happens when, in their attempt to elucidate a domain, they operate with an inadequate ontological conception, as when they assume "physical object" as a template for construing the being of equipment, or "individual mind with the capacity for empathy" as the guiding idea for elucidating the being of human sociality. Thus, if Heidegger is right, the risk of philosophy (and science) – as most of us know well but hate to admit – is to be *wronger* and in a more fundamental way off the mark than even the dumbest of unreflective amateurs.

Even if this sounds all very true to the honest ear, this shall not be our last word. It is important to note that Heidegger effectively abandoned the terms ontic, ontological, ontological difference shortly after the *Being and Time* phase (see Ontology). Apparently, the tidiness of these divisions – especially in their role as a recipe for doing philosophy – struck Heidegger as misguided (see, e.g., GA67:63). What was a difficulty in practice throughout his earlier works – namely (to put it crudely) to police the boundary between the ontic and the ontological – ultimately contributed to undoing the entire framework. Heidegger subsequently abandons the assumption that we deal with a stable distinction that we can have a working command of. It is not *us* in command here, but rather *being* itself – thus Heidegger's pronounced turn (*Kehre*) away from Dasein's centrality as a transcendental ground of being and toward an endeavor of a rather different sort: what he calls the thinking of being (*Seinsdenken*) and the history of being (see Guignon 2005).

<div align="right">*Jan Slaby*</div>

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Ontic SZ 11–19, 43, 63–66, 76, 83–85, 87–88, 114–16, 180, 196, 200, 204, 209–13; GA19:436
Ontological difference GA6.2:180–90/N4 150–58; GA9:123/97, 134–35/104–05; GA14:41, 46, 87; GA15:309–11, 346–47/FS 24–25, 48; GA24:22–25, 102, 106, 169–71, 321–24, 452–54; GA27:210, 221–27; GA29/30:521–24; GA65:207, 250, 258, 465–69

Ontic vs. ontological knowledge/truth SZ 214–30; GA3:11, 39–40; GA9:133–34/104–05; GA27:200–13, 256; GA29/30:523
Conflation of ontic/ontological SZ 76, 94, 132–33, 209–11; GA19:453; GA27:348–54; GA65:198
Beyond the ontic/ontological distinction GA65:450–51; GA67:62–63; GA74:128

FURTHER READING

Guignon 2005, Haugeland 2000, Haugeland 2013

ONTOLOGICAL CONSTITUTION (*SEINSVERFASSUNG*). SEE CONSTITUTION.

147.

ONTO-THEO-LOGY (*ONTO-THEO-LOGIE*)

"ONTO-THEO-LOGY" IS THE name for any discipline that intertwines ontological and theological approaches – by, for instance, accounting for entities in general through their ground in the highest being, or understanding God in terms of entities. Heidegger uses the term onto-theo-logy (variously hyphenated by Heidegger himself) to indicate that there is no basic division between philosophy and theology in the Western metaphysical tradition. Philosophy, approaching the question of being by means of a certain conception of logic, is, in the end, theological, whilst theology itself has typically remained tied to metaphysical assumptions derived from philosophy.

Heidegger's notion of onto-theo-logy is closely connected with his reading of Hegel. Not only is the 1957 paper "The Onto-theo-logical Constitution of Metaphysics" offered as a postscript to a seminar on Hegel, but an important early introduction of the term is found in the 1930–31 lectures on Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Indeed, the 1957 paper seems to endorse Hegel's own claim that his philosophy represents the consummation and defining self-accounting of the entire HISTORY of Western METAPHYSICS, an endorsement already implied by the published supplement to the habilitation on Duns Scotus (1916), in which Heidegger says of Hegel's system that it "took up into itself all of the fundamental motives previously operative in philosophical problems" (GA1:411/S 68). Reckoning with Hegel therefore means reckoning with the history of philosophy up to and including Hegel himself.

In the 1930–31 lectures, it is in commenting on the section of the *Phenomenology* on "Force and Understanding" that Heidegger devotes a section to "Absolute cognition as onto-theo-logy." That absolute cognition is onto-theo-logy is, Heidegger shows, integral to Hegel's core idea of speculative thinking. In accounting for entities in the light of cognition of absolute being, speculative thinking accounts for them by reference to God and does so consciously and deliberately, seeing God as the pre-eminent object of philosophical thinking itself.

This is not an individual quirk on the part of Hegel since, Heidegger immediately remarks, Aristotle too had already brought philosophy into proximity to theology, even if he never fully explicated the relationship between being as such and the divine (*thēion*). But if, as Heidegger further quotes Hegel, God is life and can only be comprehended in a living relationship, then logic itself can never be "mere" logic. Instead, it is guided by an orientation to life, to being, and, ultimately, to God. As he goes on to say, this is not intended to promote a connection to the ecclesiastical and academic discipline of theology but as indicating that the logical itself is already theological since it presupposes a particular understanding of what or how entities can be.

This also has implications for the question of TIME since, for Hegel, time too is comprised in the absolute cognition performed by speculative thinking. Again, Hegel is said to agree essentially with Aristotle on this point. As Heidegger will later summarize the opposition between Hegel and himself, Hegel maintains that "being is the essence of time" whereas he himself sees time as the essence of being. But this also means that Hegel reduces time to spatial

categories that can be adequately grasped in timeless speculation. Showing that for Hegel as for Fichte speculation presupposes a certain projection of what is to be understood by the thinking self, what speculation "knows" in knowing its other is really only itself, thus enabling Heidegger to speak also of "the onto-ego-theo-logical concept of being qua infinity" (GA32:145), where infinity is to be understood as a cosmic rather than an existential notion (cf. Hegel's reference to "the ether").

The 1957 paper "The Onto-theo-logical Constitution of Metaphysics" repeats but deepens the content of the earlier lectures. Heidegger defines the paper as part of an attempted conversation with Hegel concerning "the matter of thinking: THINKING as such" (GA11:53/ ID 42). According to Hegel, this "matter" is "the absolute idea," which he also identifies with Being, Life, and Truth. Thus "For Hegel, the matter of thinking is: being, as thinking thinking itself" (GA11:55/ID 45). This involves three further assumptions on Hegel's part: first, that in thinking being the philosopher thinks also the truth of entities, i.e., all the entities that are potentially knowable and that together make up the totality of the lived world; second, that thinking being requires thinking through the preceding history of philosophy in its dialectical self-unfolding; thirdly, that thinking being has the character of *Aufhebung*, connoting the familiar duality of the German term – at once superseding but also sublating or incorporating what has gone before. In thinking the truth of being, therefore, the Hegelian philosopher believes himself to be thinking the truth of entities and to be taking up into his own thought the essential truth of all previous philosophies.

Heidegger immediately lists his own dissent from each of these points. For him, the matter of thinking is not the identity of being and entities but their DIFFERENCE, whilst what is to be sought through the interrogation of the history of philosophy is precisely what was not thought in that history and, lastly, instead of superseding or sublating the preceding history of philosophy he sees his task as being to "step back" into the unthought realm out of which the question as to the truth of being first arises (a procedure that seems to repeat the DESTRUCTION (*Destruktion*) of the history of philosophy already proposed in SZ).

In the nature of the case, Heidegger cannot and does not offer anything that might be regarded as a clear or firm counter-proposal to Hegel. Precisely because the task is to think a difference that has remained unthought, the best we can hope for is to prepare the way for such thinking. This limitation is further stressed by the crucial identification of modern technology as the inheritor of Western metaphysics. Consequently, the step back out of the history of philosophy into thinking the difference of being and entities is also a step back from allowing thinking to be entirely dominated by the assumptions and methods of technological rationality – although Heidegger insists that this is not simply an anti-technological move but, rather, an attempt to think the essence of TECHNOLOGY itself.

When Hegel proposes thinking the truth of being, he defines such thinking as "SCIENCE" (*Wissenschaft*) and, at the same time, insists that the ultimate concept of such a science, toward which all other concepts tend and on which they depend, is God. Consequently, ontology (the science of entities as such in general) is theology and vice versa – a relationship that Heidegger immediately extends to Western metaphysics as a whole. But how did this identification come about?

Heidegger's answer focuses on the assumption that LOGIC is the definitive way in which the truth of being becomes present to thought. According to the dominant understanding of logic, logic is the science that sets out the grounds on which we are able to assert and maintain any

truth. But when the object concerned is the ground of the being of entities – of all entities, in general, and as such – this (to paraphrase Aquinas) is what is commonly assumed to be God. God, in other words, is the assumed answer to the question why there is being at all and not nothing. Thus, the science in which we know the truth of being is also the science in which we know the truth of God and, at the same time, science that is guided by logic: onto-theo-logic. Importantly, this also means identifying what is universally true of all possible entities with what is highest: in other words, the ultimate principle of explanation is also what is most to be venerated and worshipped.

Of course, precisely because Heidegger's own thought develops as a continuing and manifold conversation with the history of philosophy, he is aware that onto-theo-logy has not always been tied to the vocabulary of being or God. Thus, he lists *phusis*, *logos*, *hen*, *idea*, *energeia*, substantiality, objectivity, subjectivity, the will, the will to POWER, and the will to will as eminent ways in which the assumptions of onto-theo-logy have received concrete expression in the history of ideas (ID 66/134). At a stroke this also indicates that onto-theo-logy is a unifying thread running through Greek, Latin, and German as well as ancient, medieval, and modern philosophies and theologies. The inclusion of will to power further demonstrates that onto-theo-logy may also be present in a philosophy, such as Nietzsche's, that is explicitly atheistic, thus confirming Heidegger's view that even Nietzsche's assault on metaphysics is itself metaphysical – onto-theo-logical – in its deepest assumptions. This in turn points to the paradoxical outcome that it is precisely in and by means of a history of metaphysics in which God and being are explicitly addressed that the "forgetting of being" characteristic of the Western tradition takes place. Why? Because the focus on the identity of being and entities obscures the difference that needs to be thought if we are to think the truth of being.

It is therefore clear that Heidegger believes the term onto-theo-logy to be applicable to the entire history of Western metaphysics, inclusive of Christian philosophy and theology. However, this leaves a number of questions open. Is the "step back" to be interpreted in relation to Heidegger's interest in those known as the pre-Socratic philosophers and, if so, is he summoning us to a deliberate archaizing of philosophy? He explicitly rejects such an interpretation, even if reflection on key sayings of, e.g., Heraclitus and Parmenides may play a significant role in preparing for the new thinking that will be able to think "beyond" metaphysics. At the same time, he is also skeptical of the expression "overcoming metaphysics," which can be seen not only as striking a too heroic and perhaps Nietzschean note but also as implying a progressive view of the history of philosophy that the figure of the "step back" seems deliberately to pre-empt.

Further questions relate to how this grand narrative of metaphysics as onto-theo-logy relates to theology. It seems clear that Heidegger himself believed that medieval scholasticism was comprised in his critique, but is he correct to do so? The view has been challenged by a number of theological commentators, who, even if they concede that onto-theo-logy may apply to some later forms of Christian metaphysics (e.g., Duns Scotus or Suarez), it does not apply to Thomas Aquinas, whose doctrine of analogy allows for precisely the element of difference that Heidegger himself calls for. Clearly much depends on the extent to which Thomas understands the causality involved in the act of creation as being continuous with the chain of intra-worldly causes or whether the gift of being suggests an entirely different kind of creator/creature relationship. But even if Christian metaphysics is, in Heidegger's sense, onto-theo-logical, this might not preclude forms of faith or religious practice that did not make metaphysical

claims – perhaps Luther or Kierkegaard (although Heidegger sees even Kierkegaard as pre-supposing the terms of Hegelian metaphysics). Nor does it necessarily preclude alternative religious metaphysics offering significant resources for non-onto-theo-logical thinking about God. Affinities between Heidegger's thought and East Asian religious philosophies have long been recognized and it might also be argued that medieval Islamic and Jewish theologies (Avicenna, Averroes, and Moses Maimonides, for example) resist the language of causation and necessary being that seems to mark Christian scholasticism, thus preserving the moment of difference. Yet even if it can be argued that the critique of onto-theo-logy leaves open the possibility not only of lived religion but also of some kind of theological reflection, both the character of such reflection and its relation to philosophy would seem to call for something different from what we know of dominant religious traditions. And here we recall also that the culmination of onto-theo-logy is not just a set of metaphysical propositions but the event of planetary technology and that any religious thought – and any philosophical thinking – that is to share in the step back from onto-theo-logy will also have to reflect on its relation to technology and the manner of its participation in an intellectual culture framed by the demands of technological and managerial thinking.

George Pattison

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

"Die Onto-theo-logische Verfassung der Metaphysik" in GA11/ID; "Kants These über das Sein" in
  GA9:445–80 (esp. 449–50); GA6.2:427–29; GA32:141ff., 209; GA36/37:11, 13, 69; GA73.2:1179

FURTHER READING

Derrida 1978a, Derrida 1992a, Caputo and Scanlon 1999, Thomson 2005

148.
ONTOLOGY (*ONTOLOGIE*)

Ontology, for the Heidegger of *Being and Time*, is the study of BEING (*Sein*), where being is necessarily the being of *entities* (*Seiendes*), but not itself an entity. This all-important difference between being and entities, is what Heidegger (shortly after the publication of *Being and Time*) will call the *ontological* DIFFERENCE (e.g., GA24:22, 454; GA27:210). The adjective "ontological" accordingly refers to what concerns being – i.e., what it is for a given entity or class of entities *to be* – in sharp distinction to the adjective "ONTIC," which applies to entities as such, i.e., their properties, their various arrangements and behaviors, whatever can be known *empirically* about them. While it is pretty straightforward what entities are – simply "everything there is" – getting to terms with *being* can seem quite elusive. But, according to Heidegger, we *need* to get to terms with it – because being, and nothing but being, is the exclusive – and only – topic of philosophy. Thus, for Heidegger in this crucial phase of his work, philosophy and ontology come to the same thing.

But while "ontology" – and its various cognates – carve out a central conceptual field in Heidegger's philosophy, strictly and literally, that is true only for one circumscribed period of his work. Since this particular phase is commonly considered to be the most relevant, it is adequate to foreground it in the present entry. Only in closing will this entry also address the fact that Heidegger in later phases of his work mostly ceased to employ the terms "ontology" and "ontological difference" and how this relates to his so-called "TURN" (*Kehre*).

"Ontology" and "ontological difference" are among the focal concepts of Heidegger's philosophy in the *Being and Time* phase, which comprises most of his work in the 1920s up into the early 1930s. Heidegger calls his endeavor of reawakening and elaborating the question of being "*fundamental ontology*," that is, a project that – by delineating the contours of the "SENSE of being" (*Sinn von Sein*) – is supposed to provide the indispensable orientation for all conventional ontologies, for example the various *regional* ontologies of the special sciences. This is the forgotten task of philosophy. Besides *Being and Time*, a good source for coming to terms with this basic design of Heidegger's ontological philosophy of this phase are his writings on Kant. In the typically forceful manner of his historical interpretations, Heidegger enrolls Kant – and the *Critique of Pure Reason* in particular – unabashedly within the trajectory that leads up to his own fundamental ontology (see GA3 and GA25). Thus, he writes about Kant's endeavor in the first *Critique*: "transcendental inquiry is a type of inquiry which investigates the possibility of an understanding of being, a pre-ontological understanding of being; and such an investigation is the task of ontology. *Transcendental knowledge is ontological knowledge*" (GA25:186/127).

Grasping what is meant by "ontological difference" is a good starting point for finding one's way into Heidegger's ontological philosophy (see especially GA24:452–69). Put bluntly, part of the problem Heidegger sees with traditional philosophy is that, for all its dealings with entities (*Seiendes*), it has failed to appreciate being (*Sein*). Just as the forest can evade the beholder of trees, being – and especially the "sense of being" – can elude the analyst of entities. But what *is* being, if not itself an entity? The easiest way into this is by what initially looks like an indirect

route, which is the one that Heidegger takes in *Being and Time*, namely, approaching being via the way it presumably figures in an "understanding of being" (*Seinsverständnis*) – something that Heidegger thinks is rampant in all our lives, albeit for the most part in a tacit, pre-theoretical, unacknowledged form (i.e., "pre-ontological").

Tying being back to an understanding of being gives us a FORMAL INDICATION of what being is: namely, that in terms of which entities are *intelligible* as entities (cf. Haugeland 2013). The being of an entity is whatever one must have grasped if it can be rightly said of one that one has *understood* the entity in question. John Haugeland provides a good initial gloss on this by noting that *knowing* an entity means being able to deal with it in its *actuality*, while *understanding* an entity means being able to deal with it in terms of *its possibilities*. So when one (truly) understands a thing, one possesses more than a present acquaintance with it or command of it. Over and above that, one possesses a command of how the entity in question *will* – or, at any rate, *should* – behave under varying circumstances, including in hypothetical scenarios. Understanding, in this sense, is essentially *modal* – it concerns what is possible and impossible for a given type of entity.

Take the case of EQUIPMENT, as an example for a significant domain of inner-worldly entities – tools such as hammers, razors, brooms, screwdrivers, drycleaners, and so on. We have understood such equipment when we know how to use it in present and also in hypothetical further circumstances. In Heidegger's framework, what we have tacitly grasped when having mastered equipment (*Zeug*) is its "equipmentality" (*Zeughaftigkeit*) – i.e., what equipment's functionality and practical usability-in-context consists in. Now, returning to the ontological difference, it is clear that equipmentality is not itself a piece of equipment. Instead, equipmentality pertains to all the various ways that pieces of equipment *could possibly be* just insofar as these items, indeed, *are* equipment and not something else. This is the ontological difference in action: the being of equipment is not itself a piece of equipment – being in this mode is not itself an entity.

Now we can appreciate why Heidegger can claim, despite the alleged failure of the tradition to come to terms with the being question, that each of us already possesses – *lives* – an understanding of being. Day in, day out, we all *enact*, in all manners of routine comportment, a pre-ontological understanding of the being of various entities – that is, we know how to deal with physical objects, equipment, other people, plants, animals, and so on, both in their actuality and in their possibility. We comport ourselves quite differently to each of these entity types, and we anticipate their antics in future or hypothetical scenarios, regardless of whether we are in addition *also* capable of articulating this guiding understanding in explicit terms or not. We are not only able to respond to these entities' actual manifestations, but we project these entities onto their possibilities – for example, by being competently able to reject manifest *impossibilities* in their presumed behavior as illusions, errors, or misperceptions (cf. Haugeland 2000). While this tacit everyday understanding of being is not elaborated and thus indeed *pre-ontological*, as Heidegger puts it, it is in this direction that an explicitly worked-out ontological philosophy has to seek its insights. In fact, philosophy *is* ontology, and the making-explicit of the pre-ontological understanding of being is its major task: "philosophy becomes the freely undertaken task of elucidating and unfolding the understanding of being which belongs to the essence of human existence" (GA25:38).

In the following, the conceptual field surrounding "ontology" and "ontological difference" will be illuminated by way of a discussion of the initial sections of *Being and Time*. It is here that

Heidegger not only gives a canonical explication of the structure and setting of the question of being, but also exposes Dasein as that entity whose ontological constitution designates it to be both, that which needs to shoulder the task of answering the being question *and* that which figures in this quest as that which has to be primarily interrogated. Accordingly, it is important to understand the basic constitution of Dasein and the special status it occupies in virtue of this status, and also get a sense for the methodological difficulties that an endeavor as peculiar as that of a "fundamental ontology" will have to deal with.

Being and Time begins with Heidegger's somewhat grandiose move of exposing the "question of being" as that which has been forgotten by philosophy at least since the Greeks. The epigraph of *Being and Time* sets the tone: "Do we in our time have an answer to the question of what we really mean by the word 'being'? Not at all. So it is fitting that we should raise anew *the question of the meaning of Being*" (SZ 1). In §1, Heidegger begins to illuminate the massive task that the "re-awakening of the question of being" entails by skimming through some of the standard moves the philosophical tradition has made concerning "being." For instance, being cannot be explicated by attributing to it the status or property of an entity; as a concept, "being" is not definable because it can neither be deduced from superordinate concepts nor constructed out of subordinate ones. But all these familiar maneuvers show, according to Heidegger, is that being is not "something like an entity" (SZ 4). On the other hand, the concept "being" is, compared to all other concepts, the most self-evident, as it implicitly figures in all knowing, in all asserting, and in all comportment toward entities and toward oneself – one always necessarily draws on the term "being," and this term is perfectly intelligible in its regular employment. Still, the fact that we apparently all and always enact such a pre-theoretical understanding of being does not preclude that "in any way of comporting oneself towards entities as entities ... there lies a priori an enigma" (SZ 4). This shows, Heidegger concludes, "that it is necessary in principle to raise the question [concerning the sense of "being"] again" (*ibid.*). In fact, Heidegger famously continues, it is not only unclear what the *answer* to the question of being might be, but the question itself seems as of yet "obscure and without direction." Accordingly, there is the need to first develop and explicate the question of being so as to render it clear, before we can set out to answer it.

In §3, Heidegger focuses on what is commonly associated with the term ontology, namely the analysis of "basic concepts" (*Grundbegriffe*), either in general or in terms of the foundational study of specific domains of human knowledge. Accordingly, Heidegger turns to the sciences and, in a move that clearly anticipates (or, in any case, is later taken up by) Thomas Kuhn, distinguishes their mundane, routine practice from what he calls the "real 'movement' of the sciences," which transpires when "their basic concepts undergo a more or less radical revision which is [not] transparent to it itself" (SZ 9).[1] The level of maturity a particular scientific discipline has reached, Heidegger thus propounds, is determined by the extent to which the field in question is able to undergo a crisis of its basic concepts (*Krisis ihrer Grundbegriffe*, SZ 9; see also GA25:34).

These very basic concepts, on whose development the fame and fortune of a scientific field depends, are the business of philosophy – this is ontology as conventionally understood, in effect, good old *prima philosophia*. Heidegger also speaks of this as a "productive logic" and

---

[1] Macquarrie and Robinson omit the "not" in this sentence, thereby corrupting the intended meaning. The original reads as follows: "Die eigentliche 'Bewegung' der Wissenschaften spielt sich ab in der mehr oder minder radikalen und ihr selbst nicht durchsichtigen Revision der Grundbegriffe" (SZ 9).

characterizes this endeavor vividly as a *jumping ahead* into a certain region of being in order to disclose its prevailing being-CONSTITUTION (*Seinsverfassung*). The results of such categorical analysis – the basic ontological structures of a given domain – will then be made available to the positive sciences as "transparent directives for their questioning." Kant's *Critique of Pure Reason* is the textbook reference at this point. Kant's work is an example for such a kind of analysis, one that in this particular case takes the form of an "aprioric logic for the subject-matter of that area of being called 'NATURE'" (SZ 11) – i.e., an endeavor that delineates the being-constitution of nature as such (see Blattner 2007, 17f. for elaboration).

Now, what is most crucial here is that this "ontology taken in the widest sense" (SZ 11) is itself still in need of a guiding directive. Such foundational questioning might be more basic than the research of the positive sciences, but it is itself at risk of remaining naive and opaque to itself if it is not itself guided by a worked-out understanding of what is meant by "being" as such. Missing out on the clarification – and potential correction – of the meaning of being that tacitly informs its ontological endeavors is the primordial mistake Heidegger accords to the philosophical tradition – its FORGETFULNESS OF BEING:

> Basically, *all ontology, no matter how rich and firmly compacted a system of categories it has at its disposal, remains blind and perverted from its ownmost aim, if it has not first adequately clarified the sense of being, and conceived this clarification as its fundamental task.* (SZ 11)

Conversely, we can take from this an initial rough idea of what Heidegger, in the light of the foregoing reflections, calls *fundamental ontology*: the project that aims to provide the as of yet missing foundation for all regular ontologies by clarifying the meaning of being presupposed by all these endeavors.

After arguing for the centrality of the being question by relatively conventional means, i.e., by starting from ontologies as commonly understood, Heidegger adds an altogether different consideration in the famous §4 of *Being and Time*. Now at stake is the *ontic* priority of the question of being as opposed to its *ontological* priority. What this means becomes clear when Heidegger introduces the focal concept of *Being and Time*, namely, *Dasein*. This is the term Heidegger puts in place of "human being," "person," or "subject," with the aim to avoid the confusions these terms have caused throughout the history of philosophy. Dasein then gets characterized immediately as an entity that *is itself ontological* – as Dasein's *ontic* constitution is such that *its own being is an issue for it*. Dasein *is* in the mode of concernful engagement with its own being – it *exists*:

> Dasein is an entity which does not just occur among other entities. Rather it is ontically distinguished by the fact that, in its very being, that being is *an issue* for it. But in that case, it is a constitutive state of Dasein's being [*Seinsverfassung des Daseins*], and this implies that Dasein, in its being, has a relationship towards that being – a relationship which itself is one of being. And this means further that there is some way in which Dasein understands itself in its being, and that to some degree it does so explicitly. . . . *Understanding of being is itself a definitive characteristic of Dasein's being.* (SZ 12)

Dasein exists in such a way that it is concerned, qua its very being, with being as such – with its own being and thereby, inevitably, also with the being of the other entities it has dealings with.

This fundamental condition can be further unpacked by stating that Dasein *is* in the mode of *understanding being*. Simply put, this is because something *can* be an issue for one only on condition that one has a sense – however tacitly or fleetingly – for *what it is* that one is thus concerned with. This does not mean that Dasein already possesses a worked-out ontology. Its *being ontological* rather consists in an inchoate "pre-ontological" understanding of being, which is part and parcel of and intimately bound up with its way of being as such. John Haugeland, known for his illuminating slogans, glosses the basic meaning of "Dasein" accordingly: "Dasein is a *way of living that embodies an understanding of being*" (Haugeland 2013, 82).

This suffices for Heidegger's grander purposes. Dasein's pre-ontological understanding of being, which is essential to its ontic constitution, is the decisive condition which breathes life into the endeavor of fundamental ontology. By illuminating the being of Dasein, so his methodological thinking goes, light will ultimately be shed on the sense of being as such. The entity for whom *being itself* is at issue in its very being is the ideal guide to unveil the sense of being at large. Accordingly, fundamental ontology needs to focus on Dasein first, analyzing its being-constitution so as to eventually move from Dasein's *understanding of being*, once it is worked out and rendered transparent, toward what it is an understanding of: being as such.

This is why the *being* of Dasein moves to the center of analytical interest in *Being and Time*. Heidegger reserves a specific term for it, namely, EXISTENCE. While Dasein is an entity, "existence" designates *the being* of this entity – the very being to which Dasein always necessarily comports itself in one way or other. Ontically, this means that Dasein in each case understands itself *existentiell*, that is, in terms of certain *possibilities to be* that it might either choose and actively embrace or else miss out on or slip into unthinkingly (in any case, matters of the concrete lives of individuals). These matters of concrete existence, however, are strictly *ontical* affairs of each individual Dasein and thus not the business of fundamental ontology. What *does* concern fundamental ontology is the analysis of the basic, constitutive make-up of existence as such – matters that are not *existentiell* but rather EXISTENTIAL. This is where we have to look in order to delineate the basic structures of the pre-theoretical understanding of being which will set us on the path of the meaning of being as such. That is why fundamental ontology – the endeavor capable of igniting and guiding all regional ontologies – will have to be sought in the existential analytic of Dasein. Only here are we dealing with an entity that *always already*, whether reflectively or not, comports itself essentially toward that which is at issue in the question of being: "the question of being is nothing other than the radicalization of an essential tendency-of-being [*Seinstendenz*] which belongs to Dasein itself – the pre-ontological understanding of being" (SZ 15).

Alas, this is where the real problems only begin to show up. It is nice and good, one might say, that Dasein has been credibly exposed as the primary entity for which being itself is at issue and that therefore has to figure as the prime target of a fundamental ontology. But how is the required analytic of Dasein supposed to be performed? What methodology might be employed in order to carry out this peculiar endeavor with any chance for success? The problem starts with the simple fact that we, individual instances of Dasein, usually have no idea of our alleged pre-theoretical understanding of being, let alone a competent way to study it systematically. Unreflectively enacting an understanding of being is one thing, explicitly thematizing and rendering it transparent quite another. As Heidegger writes, echoing Saint Augustine: "ontically, of course, Dasein is not only close to us – even that which is closest: we *are* it, each of us, we ourselves. In spite of this, or rather for just this reason, it is ontologically that which is farthest" (SZ 15).

What is worse, not only do we lack a feasible way of getting at our understanding of being, it is in fact part of our very ontological make-up as Dasein that we are inclined to *explicitly* understand our own being – erroneously – in terms of those mundane everyday objects we have regular dealings with. We are prone to construe our own being, routinely, as if it were just some physical object among others – a material thing with certain properties, such as a tool or a (rational) animal. Heidegger calls this tendency the "ontological back-projection of worldly understanding on the interpretation of Dasein" (SZ 16). Related to this default mode of self-objectification is a problematic brought about by language and common sense as such. Ordinary discourse is a massive leveling force that constantly shoves us out of touch with the phenomena and into all sorts of hopelessly muddled-up, conventional understandings. Borrowing a term from Harry Frankfurt, we might call this the tendency of everyday discourse to slide back into bullshit (Frankfurt 2005). Haugeland, as always, nails it:

> Heidegger's demon – the lurking danger in philosophy's way – as he sees it, is not deception, not unintelligibility, not confusion, but precisely this unimpeachable, question-smothering, scarcely even noticed *sound common sense* – the opiate of ontology. (Haugeland 2013, 69)

So then, how can philosophy reconfigure its analytical purview in order to prevent the slide back into the morasses of the ordinary? How to regain the phenomena so as to perform the ontological analysis of Dasein with a chance for genuine insight? This is where Heidegger's considerations on method come in.

On the face of it, these considerations, provided in the difficult §7 of *Being and Time*, might seem both trivial and dogmatic. Heidegger claims that the proper way to do philosophy is by engaging in PHENOMENOLOGY, chiefly because phenomenology heeds the maxim "To the things themselves" (SZ 27; see the MATTER). But this slogan might seem empty (what scientific method worth its salt does *not* aspire to approach the "things themselves"?), and the recourse to phenomenology a mere postulate. However, in view of the foregoing considerations, we already have a sense for how *hard* it in fact is to actually heed phenomenology's battle cry. The "things themselves," let alone their *being*, are exactly not readily approachable and easily tractable. What phenomenology brings to the table is both the *tools* necessary to succeed in this muddled-up situation and the *attitude* required to master this challenge.

Heidegger unpacks the meaning of "phenomenology" by discussing both composite elements, *phenomenon* and *logos* – and he does that in his characteristic way both etymologically and by way of interpretation of what he takes to be their Greek original meanings. *Phainomenon*, according to Heidegger, is that which shows itself from itself. Initially, this can mean everything that there is, but ultimately what "phenomenon" refers to in the full sense of phenomenology is *being* itself (cf. SZ 37), so that phenomenology as a philosophical method is nothing other than "the science of the being of entities – ontology" (SZ 37). *Logos* he renders as, in effect, *telling it like it is* (drawn from Greek *logos apophantikos*): bringing to light, exposing, laying something out into the open.

It is of course no accident that these Heideggerian renditions of these focal concepts, as it were, meet up; and that is what *phenomenology* is essentially about: bringing the phenomena, those self-standing somethings which show themselves – but which might also be covered up – out into the open by way of *logos apophantikos*, i.e., by telling it (them) as they are in themselves, a telling that both directly draws from and points to the things themselves. In terms of what

Heidegger mainly drives at, this means of course: bringing the *being* of entities out into the open. That this is by no means a trivial undertaking is clear from what was said before. While indeed the phenomena tend to show themselves, this does not pertain to their being. Instead, a massive current in Dasein and in worldly affairs at large runs counter to being's revealing itself, viz. common sense and ordinary discourse. These have long taken hold of philosophy, science, and learned discourse at large – both by saddling their practitioners with illusionary ideas but also, more fundamentally, by sprinkling reality itself with layers over layers of sheer humbug. Phenomenology is thus the struggle of *bringing to light* what in some sense *already lies in the open* but whose very openness is *buried under heaps of confusion*, *simulacra*, IDLE TALK, and so on.

It is clear that such a vexing condition not only calls for proper tools, but also for the right attitude – one suited for rigorously fighting and resisting that sinister drift toward the common and vulgar. Thus, crucial for aligning the *phainomena* and *logos* in the right way, is the philosopher's *existential commitment* – which is more than merely an earnest engagement with some subject-matter or other. It is the anchoring of philosophical concepts in one's own being in such a way that one literally *lives* what is at stake in this endeavor. *Being* cannot figure as the content of detached considerations or theoretical cognitions, but is that which gets disclosed by being *lived* in concrete existence. Undertaking an existential commitment, *staking oneself* – is what is required for disclosing being (see also GA27:379–86). So essentially, ontology is a *self-transformation* on the part of existence itself, buying in, waking up to oneself, authentically (see also Denker 2013, 63f.). Haugeland makes the same point by referring to the "existential" status of philosophical concepts:

> grasping philosophical concepts – concepts like world, finitude, individuation, and the rest – is no mere cognitive achievement. You do not actually *understand* them except insofar as they are making a real difference in how you live. In other words, you cannot genuinely come to have those concepts without also changing as a person. (Haugeland 2013, 75)

In light of this, Heidegger concludes his – admittedly sketchy – considerations on method by stating that philosophy proceeds in the manner of a *universal phenomenological ontology* that is both grounded in and mattering to existence itself:

> Philosophy is universal phenomenological ontology, and takes its departure from the hermeneutic of Dasein, which, as an analytic of existence, has made fast the guiding line for all philosophical inquiry at the point where it *arises* and to which it *returns.* (SZ 38)

This concludes our exposition of "ontology," "ontological," and "ontological difference" in the *Being and Time* period. What remains to be considered is the fate of these terms in Heidegger's later writings.

Why did Heidegger abandon his positive employment of these terms only a few years after they played such a prominent role in his thought? This reorientation has to do with his larger *turn* away from anchoring the being question in an analytic of Dasein – a move that became known plainly as "the TURN" (*Kehre*). In short, from about 1930 onward, Heidegger ceased to think that being could be approached by way of a transcendental analysis of Dasein's *understanding of being* (see Sheehan 2010 for a contestable yet informative discussion of the various meanings of *die Kehre*). The turn then consisted in reversing this very order: being (now often

spelled *Seyn* instead of *Sein*) is not in any way a "MACHINATION" (*Machenschaft*) of Dasein, but instead something like a gift, a MYSTERY transpiring in a dimension that is an unattainable enabling ground of Dasein and its existential make-up (*das Ereignis*; see ADAPTATION). Heidegger's endeavor from then on is better characterized as the HISTORY OF BEING (*Seinsgeschichte*); philosophy gives way to THINKING of being (*Seinsdenken*; see Guignon 2005).

Some of Heidegger's most radical writing apropos this reorientation can be found in his collection of aphorisms, penned circa 1938/39, entitled *Overcoming of Metaphysics* (GA67). One can see here how far especially the binary distinction between being and entities – or "ontic" and "ontological" – is now considered by Heidegger to be part of the problem, not a route to solving the riddle of being. Consider the following passage, written in Heidegger's elliptic notebook style:

> The distinction between ontic and ontological [is] untenable – [it is] based on the distinction, which precisely levels everything down to "two worlds" and does not adequately "distinguish" either of the two – neither the entity as such nor being as such; also [it is] already suggested that the distinction of ontic and ontological is ambiguous. (GA67:63)

The sharp distinction brought about by the contrast of the two terms "being" and "entity" does not exactly perform *the work* of distinguishing – in the sense of actually differentiating, or making the differentiating of being into entities tractable. Instead, this distinction merely postulates, not unlike traditional metaphysics, a duality of "two worlds": separate realms, the mundane (entities) and behind or "above" it the somehow arcane (being), from which the mundane derives its meaning more or less unilaterally (but see GA27:210 for a more balanced earlier assessment of this problematic). Not much has changed in comparison to traditional metaphysics – or, at any rate, this is what Heidegger seems to think now. In a related key, Heidegger now chastizes his construal of being-in-the-world as a primordial "transcendence" as a regression into METAPHYSICS (GA67:63).

To be sure, Heidegger keeps talking of the *difference* of being and entities (*Sein* and *Seiendes*) in his later writings, yet he no longer calls this difference *ontological*. A helpful discussion is in the second text of *Identität und Differenz* (GA11/ID), where it again becomes clear that it is not the difference as such that is problematic, but rather its concretistic interpretation – the assumption of separable realms, or the thought that "being" might be even so much as thematized in isolation from entities (cf. GA11:60–79/ID 51–74). Accordingly, one can say that the destiny of philosophy remains that of inhabiting the difference of being and entities, of projecting entities onto their being, and so on – yet, it would be a mistake to consider this to be a straightforward "task" that could be executed according to any kind of clear-cut recipe or blueprint. Instead, philosophy is more like the – meditative? poetic? – stance of letting oneself be pulled into and dragged along by the intractable and unpredictable play of difference between being and entities.

Whatever the ultimate merits of *the turn* for Heidegger's thinking overall, this move certainly spells doom for the career of the conceptual family of "ontology" in his later writings. It is worth taking note of the fact that the very thinker who brought ontology back on the agenda of contemporary philosophy so resolutely turned his back on that notion so soon thereafter.

Jan Slaby

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Ontology SZ 11–19, 38, 44, 52, 63–66; GA3:11–14, 111, 124; GA19:207, 438; GA24:22–25, 106; GA29/30:521–23; GA63:1–3
Ontological SZ 56–59, 63–66, 72, 83–85, 180–83, 196, 200, 204, 209–13
Ontological difference GA6.2:180–90/N4 150–58; GA14:41, 46, 87; GA15:309–11, 346–47/FS 24–25, 48; GA24:22–25, 102, 106, 169–71, 321–24, 452–54; GA27:210, 221–27; GA29/30:521–24; GA65:207, 250, 258, 465–69
Ontic vs. ontological knowledge/truth SZ 214–30; GA3:11, 39–40; GA27:200–13, 256; GA29/30:523
Conflation of ontic/ontological SZ 76, 94, 132–33, 209–11; GA19:453; GA27:348–54; GA65:198
Beyond the ontic/ontological distinction GA65:450–51; GA67:62–63; GA74:128

FURTHER READING

Blattner 2007, Denker 2013, Frankfurt 2005, Guignon 2005, Haugeland 2000, Sheehan 2010

149.

OPEN (*OFFENE*)

A̲N̲ O̲P̲E̲N̲ I̲S̲ a domain in which things are easily accessible or exposed. As long as things lie hidden from us, we have no access to any truths concerning them. They have to come out or be brought out into the open, and it is equally necessary that we occupy a suitable place in the open and be open to them. Heidegger adapts these ordinary nominative, adjectival, and verbal uses of "open" and "openness" to characterize T̲R̲U̲T̲H̲ as unconcealment. The employment of these metaphors increases as his thinking shifts from the transcendental-ontological truth of D̲A̲S̲E̲I̲N̲ to the historical truth of A̲D̲A̲P̲T̲A̲T̲I̲O̲N̲ or the event that appropriates Dasein and B̲E̲I̲N̲G̲ to one another. The open is the historical place (the time-space of decisions) that both makes up and discloses how we exist with things, with one another, and with ourselves. The openness of the open coincides with our openness to things and their openness to us. Since Heidegger construes truth as the unconcealment of entities and since their unconcealment, presupposing concealment, is – among other things – what it means for them to be, he also employs "open" and "openness" as metonyms for "being." In other words, the "open" and "openness" are one of many ways that Heidegger speaks of being. "The open, in which every being is freed . . . *is being itself*" (GA54:224).

In "The Origin of the Work of Art" (where the shift mentioned above has already occurred), Heidegger distinguishes the openness of the world from the open in which that openness is contested. "The world is the self-opening openness of the wide paths of decisions" that decide a historical P̲E̲O̲P̲L̲E̲'s fate (GA5:35/26). Yet there is this openness only if there is something closed off, and it is the essence of A̲R̲T̲, among other things, to bring this opposition itself into the open. Thus, the truth-defining contest between world and E̲A̲R̲T̲H̲, C̲L̲E̲A̲R̲I̲N̲G̲ (truth) and concealment (untruth), is waged in the open, i.e., in and over an open domain. "Truth is the primordial conflict, in which in some manner respectively the open is contested, the open into which everything that presents and establishes itself as an entity, stands and from which it holds back" (GA5:48/36).

Art is one way that truth, so construed, historically occurs. Art, like L̲A̲N̲G̲U̲A̲G̲E̲ generally, brings a particular being into the open in such a way that it "first illumines the openness of the open" (GA5:50/37, 61/46). This openness of the open is at the same time "the openness of entities, the truth" (GA5:50/37). To visualize these two ways of speaking of openness, namely, as applying to the open and to entities, consider the following homely example. Suppose I bring one of the items hidden in a box into the open in the light of day. The openness (unconcealment) of that particular entity both depends upon and coincides with the openness (unconcealment) of the open. But suppose that it is pitch dark and I retrieve a flashlight (a metaphor for the artwork) from the box. The flashlight's beam opens up an open space; it provides for the openness (unconcealment) of the space in which other things are open, unconcealed to me, so long as they've been brought into the open. At the same time, it is abundantly evident from the flashlight's beam (and its scope) that something remains hidden.

As noted earlier, the world and the earth vie with one another over the open domain, the world opening up its openness, the earth defying that openness (GA5:57/42: "The openness of the open finds its supreme resistance in the earth"). This strife is inherent to them such that they need each other the way the two fighters in the ring do. Their opposition is marked by a fundamental line of demarcation or RIFT (*Grundriß*) that, far from constituting a rupture, marks the origin of their wholehearted unity. In the artwork that strife is opened up (not manufactured) inasmuch as the artwork "occupies the open domain of the truth [*das Offene der Wahrheit*]." But this occupying can only occur in such a way that what is to be brought forth (the artwork as the demarcation) entrusts itself to the self-concealing "that juts forth into the open" (GA5:51/38).

In 1945 Heidegger notes that, when we peer into a horizon, it is an open region (*Offenes*) but it does not have its openness from the fact that we look into it. A horizon is only one side of an open region that surrounds us. The open region in itself, i.e., apart from any horizon – alternatively, the region of all regions that provides accommodation (*Unterkunft*) for everything – is "the abiding expanse that, gathering everything together, opens itself so that in it the open is held and held up, to let everything go forward in its own way of residing." In contrast to a horizon that comes toward us, the open region in itself eludes us, withdraws from us (GA77:112–16).

Heidegger aligns the clearing with the open in different ways. In 1949 he speaks of "the clearing of a worldly open" in which alone what is present unfolds essentially, achieving a prominence over the clearing itself in the process (GA79:50). In 1957 he observes that "the presencing *needs* the open of a clearing and is, for that reason, delivered over to the human essence" (GA79:121). Thus, an open in one sense includes a clearing, in another sense belongs to a clearing.

Anticipating Heidegger, Rilke also employs the "open" to characterize entities as a whole and modern humanity's plight, caught up in processes of representation and production, bent on reducing the open to an object (GA5:300/225, 312/234). However, by construing the open, much like Nietzsche might, as a ceaseless succession and plenum of entities vying with one another, Rilke continues to think metaphysically, not historically. Nothing could be further, Heidegger submits, from his conception of the open as the free space of the clearing of being, differentiating itself from every particular being (GA54:226; GA73.1:30f.).

Daniel Dahlstrom

FURTHER READING

Dahlstrom 2013a

OPEN SPACE OF PUBLICNESS (*OFFENTLICHKEIT*). SEE PUBLICNESS.

ORIGIN (*URSPRUNG*). SEE LEAP.

ORIGINARY (*URSPRÜNGLICH*). SEE LEAP.

150.
OSCILLATION (*SCHWINGUNG*)

Oscillation is a periodic movement of vibration or swinging (*Schwung*) around a point of equilibrium. We ordinarily think of oscillation as a movement of entities – the regular periodic motion of a pendulum as it swings back and forth across the equilibrium position, for instance, or the recurring rise and fall of waves on the ocean. Heidegger is not interested in this ontic form of oscillation. Instead, he argues that there is an ontological analogue of ontic oscillating motion – that ONTOLOGY is itself not something static, but instead depends on a MOVEMENT that is periodic or recurring rather than linear and progressive. Ontology is, in many key respects, dynamic and involves alteration or fluctuation rather than a stable, constant presence.

Heidegger describes SELFHOOD, for instance, as a kind of rhythmic oscillation, rather than a property that is the attribute of an occurrent substance (GA58:258). To be an individual, Heidegger suggests, is to uncover and respond to situations in a way that manifests a recurring pattern.

Perhaps Heidegger's most important and sustained use of the idea of oscillation is found in his discussions of TIME and the ontology of temporal entities. There are many entities for which to *be* is to be subject to change over time. Such temporally structured entities are subject to changes which are continuous, successive, and measurable relative to changes occurring in other entities. Time itself is widely thought of as moving linearly and progressively from the past to the future. Heidegger argues, however, that time should be understood as a kind of oscillation. We are temporal entities because we are constantly being carried away to, and then brought back from, different ECSTASES or temporal horizons of past, present, and future. To inhabit time is to participate in the oscillation of "being-carried-away" – a process that Heidegger compares to the way "a living animal can stretch out feelers in different directions and then retract them again" (GA26:268). Time should thus be thought of as something active, as a "temporaliz*ing*" (*Zeitigung*), Heidegger explains. It is "the free oscillation of the whole of primordial TEMPORALITY; time reaches and contracts itself" (GA26:268). This movement of time – dynamic and periodic rather than linear in nature – is what gives temporal agents an open temporal span within which they retain the past and project into the future and this, in turn, allows them to understand entities in terms of their various possibilities. Each entity that we encounter in time is defined in terms of the way its own past and its future possibilities are unified with its current involvements. Thus entities that are contained in and defined by time depend on the different temporal horizons or ecstases hanging together in the right sort of way. That temporal "unity of horizon," Heidegger claims, is not achieved by a subjective mental act of unification. It is brought about by the horizons or ecstases oscillating in harmony with each other: "the essence of time lies in the ecstatic unitary oscillation" (GA26:269). This means that the apparently linear progressive movement of events in time is only possible on Heidegger's account because we open up a space of possibilities by oscillating between temporal horizons, and because those horizons themselves swing or oscillate in harmony with each other. Entities

reveal their character, in other words, as we oscillate back and forth between their factical properties and their possibilities – between entities and being itself (see GA70:126).

The idea of temporal oscillation continues to play an important ontological role in Heidegger's later works. Heidegger comes to think of BEING as itself having a HISTORY. The primary dynamic that moves this history is the tendency toward ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*) – a tendency toward settling into mutually adjusted and fitted relationships that constitute and define entities in their being. Adaptation, in turn, involves a process through which agents align and synchronize their anticipations and dispositions until a "unicity of oscillation" (*Einzigkeit der Schwingung*) is achieved (GA65:252). As inhabitants of a given world oscillate between, on the one hand, trying to hear and respond to the call to a new order and, on the other hand, carrying on their old practices on the basis of the dispositions that make them belong to the prior order, adaptation occurs and a new style of BEYNG arises: "the ad-aptation, beyng" is "the oscillation of the TURN between call and belongingness" (GA65:380). A particular world, in turn, can be understood as a certain pattern or style of oscillation between the facts and the possibilities for developing those facts.

In his later works on LANGUAGE, Heidegger advances a view of linguistic sense as a kind of oscillation between different meanings (see GA12:157/OWL 64). On this view, linguistic expressions acquire their sense precisely in the way that they can be heard as fluctuating between expressing different meanings. Heidegger's interest in poetry is in large part a result of the way poetry manifestly depends on such linguistic oscillation.

Mark A. Wrathall

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA9:423/320; GA11:46–47/HR 292–93; GA12:113/OWL 27–28; GA26:268–70; GA29/30:222; GA39:14–15, 23; GA46:201, 242; GA52:15, 67; GA53:141; GA58:258; GA65:57, 251–52, 293, 321, 343, 351, 372, 380, 383, 400; GA66:248, 252; GA70:124–26; GA77:159; GA79:126

OUT-THERE-NESS (*VORHANDENHEIT*). SEE OCCURRENTNESS.

OUTLINE (*AUFRIß*). SEE RIFT.

151.
OVERCOMING (*ÜBERWINDUNG*)

To overcome means "to dispose of" – not in the sense of "getting rid of," but rather in the sense of having something "at your disposal," being able to deal freely with it. "To overcome does not mean 'to push away,'" Heidegger explains, "but rather 'to take into a new disposition'" (GA9:63/51). In this new disposition, that which is overcome "will no longer have any power to define" us (GA6.2:330/N4 223), but it will continue to inform our understanding of ourselves and our circumstances.

Heidegger's concept of overcoming is closely related to Hegel's notion of sublation (*Aufhebung*), and Heidegger explicitly notes the parallel. For Heidegger, overcoming (as with sublating for Hegel) signifies attaining a freedom from previous constraints on the way we understand ourselves, the WORLD around us, and our place in that world. When these limitations are surmounted, the overcoming consists in our simultaneously superseding and retaining the prior understanding. Drawing on Hegel, Heidegger explains that

> the "progress" of the SPIRIT that actualizes itself in history carries within it a "principle of exclusion." This exclusion however does not lead to the removal of what is excluded, but rather to its overcoming. The freedom of spirit is characterized by such a making-oneself-free that overcomes and at the same time continues to bear [what is overcome]. (SZ 434)

In a process of Heideggerian overcoming, just as in a process of Hegelian sublation, the past conditions are retained precisely as something that was overcome. When we experience an overcoming, then, the current actual situation shows up as inherently structured temporally in relation to the past. As Hegel puts it in his preface to the *Phenomenology of Spirit*, "the *result* is not the *actually existing* whole, but rather it [i.e., what actually is] together with its becoming" (Hegel 1972, 13). The new situation thus shows up *as* a situation that became the situation that it is through our learning how to overcome prior obstacles or limits. In inhabiting the situation, then, we have an ongoing sense of having arrived at the new situation by leaving behind the past.

Two prominent examples of processes that, according to Heidegger, necessarily involve the logic of overcoming are Christian conversion, and – most centrally for Heidegger – preparing for a new beginning of history that can supersede the prior history of METAPHYSICS (a history that culminates in our contemporary age of TECHNOLOGY; see HISTORY OF BEING).

Faith or rebirth through conversion is an example of a kind of transformation in which the old self is overcome, but the new self has an enduring understanding of itself as redeemed and transformed:

> the sense of the Christian occurrence as rebirth is that Dasein's prefaithful, i.e., unbelieving, existence is sublated [*aufgehoben*] therein. Sublated does not mean done away with, but raised up, kept, and preserved in the new creation. One's pre-Christian existence is indeed existentielly, ontically, overcome in faith. But this

existentiell overcoming of one's pre-Christian existence (which belongs to faith as rebirth) means precisely that one's overcome pre-Christian Dasein is existentially, ontologically included within faithful existence. (GA9:63/51)

Thus, in the overcoming that characterizes conversion, that which is overcome remains. But it remains in a form that is no longer definitive of the existence of the convert.

In the 1920s and 1930s, Heidegger came slowly to the idea that metaphysics was something to be overcome. At first this took the form of proclaiming the need to reject "all ontology" and transcendental approaches to philosophy (GA29/30:522), or of declaring "the necessity of overcoming the domination of logic in metaphysics" (GA27:330). Following Carnap's publication of "The Elimination [Überwindung] of Metaphysics through the Logical Analysis of Language" in 1931, however – an article notorious for its critique of Heidegger's alleged use of "metaphysical pseudo-statements" – Heidegger explicitly took up the theme of overcoming metaphysics. Carnap argued that "a radical overcoming of metaphysics is achieved" simply through the logical analysis of philosophical claims – an analysis, that is, that makes explicit the epistemological content and logical structure of the concepts employed in metaphysical discourse. Such an analysis, according to Carnap, will demonstrate that metaphysical claims are "*entirely meaningless*" (Carnap 1959, 219–20). Heidegger's subsequent work on metaphysics can be seen as an extended rejoinder to Carnap and a sharp attack on the view, shared by many, that metaphysics could be overcome simply by developing a logically more disciplined or rigorous use of language. Heidegger argues, to the contrary, that the logicization of discourse is itself a phenomenon of the thoroughgoing domination of metaphysics in its technological form. A metaphysic – a particular style of understanding being and truth – is, according to Heidegger, embodied in the practices and artifacts of a culture. Heidegger was thus critical of the idea that metaphysics could be overcome merely by adopting a different cognitive standpoint (see GA6.1:339/N2 118). Such an idea, he argues, is "an absurd gesture of thought" (GA6.2:330/N4 223), because cognition is itself grounded in our background understanding of being and truth. As long as this background understanding is metaphysical in character, any cognitive standpoint we adopt will itself be essentially shaped by the prevailing metaphysic. The idea that we could overcome metaphysics through a positivist form of logical analysis, Heidegger argues, "is only the final entanglement in metaphysics" (GA7:77–78/EP 92) – a manifestation of a techno-metaphysical belief that we can, through an act of willing and self-determination, change our basic orientation to the world.

The final overcoming of metaphysics thus requires, among other things, a sense for the history of metaphysics and a recognition of the way we are historically determined. It also requires us to foster practices that turn us away from the will to mastery and control – overcoming requires that "the will to overcome disappears" (GA9:424/320). Heidegger developed his account in a sustained engagement with Nietzsche's efforts to overcome NIHILISM through an overturning of Platonism.

Mark A. Wrathall

OWNEDNESS (*EIGENTLICHKEIT*). SEE AUTHENTICITY.

P

PARTICULARITY (*JEWEILIGKEIT*). SEE MINENESS.

PASSAGE OVER (*ÜBERGANG*). SEE TRANSITION.

PATH (*WEG*). SEE WAY.

PEOPLE (*MENSCH*). SEE HUMAN BEING.

PEOPLE (*DAS MAN*). SEE ANYONE, THE.

152.
PEOPLE (*VOLK*)

A PEOPLE IS A form of historical being-with that is rooted in a homeland (*Heimat*) and that is subject to decision. Because of this definition he joined with those, like Hegel, who dismissed the idea that Africans were peoples on the grounds that they lacked HISTORY in the operative sense (GA38:83–84/71–72). He also joined with those among his contemporaries who questioned whether the Jews constituted a people given that they were nomadic (NHS 56). The two texts just cited are from the period 1933–34 and it is not surprising to find that Heidegger's most scandalous remarks about the people belong to this period when he was Rector of Freiburg University and its immediate aftermath. It was also at this time that he was most clear about the relation between a people and the state. In February 1934 he claimed that "the highest actualization of human being happens in the state" and that in the Führer state the actualization of the people happens in the Führer (NHS 64). The nature of the decision to which a people was called was clarified in a speech he delivered in November 1933 in support of Hitler's decision to withdraw Germany from the League of Nations. In that context and in the name of a will to an ethnic (*völkisch*) self-responsibility, Heidegger described it as an essential law of human existence that a people must offer allegiance (*Gefolgschaft*) in order for it still to be a people (GA16:188–89/HC 47–49).

Much has been made of the single reference to the people in *Being and Time* where he presented the people as the community in which DESTINY unfolds (SZ 385); nevertheless, this remark seems to be free from the single-minded focus on the German people and its unique historical mission that seems to characterize his account of the people in the 1930s. Furthermore, it seems that in large part Heidegger's conception of what constitutes a people was shaped by opposition to the dominant conceptions of the people found among his Nazi contemporaries. This is especially clear from his 1934 *Logic* course that contains his most sustained philosophical reflection on the concept of the people. Above all, he rejected accounts of the people in terms of biology or folklore (*Volkskunde*), as well as conceptions of the people in terms of the body, the soul, or the SPIRIT. These conceptions present answers to the question of *what* a given people is, but they fail to address *who* we ourselves are, which is always a matter of decision (GA38:50–60/45–53). It is because belonging to a people is a matter of decision, that membership cannot be determined simply by reference to descent or to rootedness. Instead, replicating his temporal account of CARE (*Sorge*) from *Being and Time*, he presented the people as determined by its futural mission, its present labor, and its mood (GA38:151–56/125–29).

Heidegger's often repeated idea that the Germans were not yet a people but were coming to themselves sounds today somewhat transgressive because it is more futural than backward-looking and so seems to promise a way to avoid the more essentialist and biologistic approaches

that we tend to associate with the Nazis (GA36/37:3/3; also GA86:177). Indeed, it is striking that this idea of a people to come is less pronounced in Heidegger's Rectoral Address, *The Self-Assertion of the German University*, than other texts of the time, as if he suspected it would not be uniformly greeted. Nevertheless, the idea of the Germans as a "becoming people" can be found among ultraconservative Germans at this time, such as the journalist Hermann Ullmann, the author in 1929 of *Das werdende* Volk. By contrast, Heidegger was more inventive when in the context of a reading of Hölderlin's 1801 letter to Böhlendorff, he presented a people in terms of its transforming its endowment (*Mitgegebenes*) into what was given to it as its appointed task (*Aufgegebenes*, GA39:292). This led to the striking formulation to be found in "The Origin of the Work of Art" where he described history as "the transporting of a people into its appointed task as the entry into its endowment (GA5:65/49). These formulations show how Heidegger in the first half of the 1930s took the account of the thrown project of the individual DASEIN from *Being and Time* and translated it into an account in which the very HISTORY OF BEING was at stake in the way a unique people took up its task.

Nevertheless, as Heidegger's reflections on the history of being developed and became aligned with the task of overcoming METAPHYSICS, the idea of the people became a casualty. By 1943 he included the people, alongside community, nation, continent, and planet, in a list of terms that he judged to be historically relevant only as a result of Descartes' conception of subjectivity (GA54:206/137). He elsewhere rejected the term "race" in a similar way (GA69:71). In other words, these were metaphysical terms that had to be abandoned. Heidegger no longer believed that the notion of the people would play a part in bringing about the overcoming of metaphysics and another INCEPTION of thinking and so it became much less prominent in his writing.

Robert Bernasconi

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA16:107–17/HR 108–16 (the notorious Rectoral Address where the notion of the people is especially prominent)
GA38:56–170/49–142 (Heidegger's most sustained philosophical discussion of the people)
NHS 15–64 (notes from a seminar that as such must be used with care)

FURTHER READING

Bernasconi 2013b, Phillips 2005, Sikka 1994

153.
PERCEPTION (*WAHRNEHMUNG*)

Perception is the mode of comportment in which, because one holds back from using entities within one's environment, those entities are present in terms of their own features, rather than as fulfilling a function and withdrawing from determinate awareness. *Wahrnehmung* is the German equivalent of "perception," though the German construction is important and lost in translation: *Wahr-nehmen* could be more literally translated as "true-taking." This is, for Heidegger, no accident: perception is a mode of unconcealment and hence TRUTH. It is no surprise, then, that perception plays a central role in Heidegger's lecture courses on truth.[1] Matters are complicated, however, by the fact that the word most commonly rendered as "perception" in Macquarrie and Robinson's translation of SZ is not *Wahrnehmung* at all but, rather, *Vernehmung*. This would seem an odd translation to a native German speaker. For while *vernehmen* can just about mean "to hear," a more natural translation would be "to interrogate." Heidegger's translators are not simply being obtuse, however. For *Vernehmung* is the manner in which perception unconceals, namely, through interrogating that which is perceived.

Heidegger's most extensive treatment of perception appears in *The Basic Problems of Phenomenology*. He begins by attempting to avert what he considers to be two common misunderstandings of the phenomenon. First, Heidegger denies that perception is a relation between a subject and an object. Second, Heidegger denies that perception is a relation internal to subjective CONSCIOUSNESS, as if between a perceptual act and sense data (cf. GA24:85, 91). Rather, Heidegger claims, perception is a mode of COMPORTMENT (*Verhalten*). Because perception is a way of BEING-IN-THE-WORLD, it cannot fail to relate *to* the WORLD; perception is relational just by dint of being a mode of comportment, irrespective of whether one has an objectively real entity in view. And because perception is a way of being-in-the-*world* it is not a relation to a subjectively interior mental event either; in perceiving we are out among entities, not trapped within ourselves. But there are many modes of comportment, so what is distinctive about *perceptual* comportments in particular?

Heidegger most emphatically contrasts perceptual comportment with circumspective withdrawal. When immersed in a practical activity, entities tend to figure for one simply in terms of the functions they fulfill. For instance, upon walking into a lecture theatre the door is manifest as "for entering," the chalk "for writing," and so on. In this way, entities are primarily encountered *as* what they are *for* and show up neither as the focal point of one's attention nor as bearing determinate qualities. *Wahrnehmung*, in contrast, "takes from the OCCURRENT its coveredness and releases it so that it can show itself *in its own self*" (GA24:98, translation modified, emphasis added). In other words, in *perceiving* an entity the entity is no longer revealed simply as what it is for, and hence purely in terms of its practical function within a context, but rather in terms of its *own* present features. For instance, when struggling to find fifth gear one might turn to look at the

---

[1] GA34 and GA36/37 focus on Plato's *Theaetetus*; GA21 and GA17 concentrate on Aristotle; and GA24 centers on Kant.

diagram on top of the gearstick, only to discover that this particular lawnmower has only four gears. In this case, the gearstick is no longer manifest simply as what it is for, but also as having features of its own. In order to allow the gearstick to show up in this way, however, one has to stop using it as one had before, for otherwise it would just withdraw from focal attention into use. Thus: "In this kind of '*dwelling*' as a holding-oneself-back from any manipulation or utilisation, the *perception* of the occurrent is consummated" (SZ 61–62).

According to Heidegger, "every perceiving is a perceiving *as*." That *as which* the entity is perceived is, in our example, the gearstick. Heidegger takes this to imply that in order to perceive the gearstick one must understand in advance *what* gearsticks are. But in order to *perceive* the gearstick one must also understand *how* it is, namely: being present in such a way that it can be examined to reveal features. For this reason, Heidegger claims that in perceiving an entity one also understands it as being occurrent. Because perception presupposes an understanding of both what and how the perceived *is*, Heidegger claims that "a being can be uncovered, whether by way of perception or some other mode of access only if the being of this being is already disclosed – only if I already understand it" (GA24:102). And because perception is a matter of encountering entities on the basis of an UNDERSTANDING of their being, it is a mode of UNCONCEALMENT or truth, for the understanding of being wrapped up in perception allows entities to be revealed as they are.

We can now also see why Heidegger sometimes refers to *Wahrnehmung* as *Vernehmung* and therefore why it is not so strange to translate both terms as "perception." Heidegger gives perhaps his clearest elaboration of *vernehmen* in *Introduction to Metaphysics*: "On the one hand *vernehmen* means to take in [*hin-nehmen*], to let something come to oneself – namely, what shows itself, what appears. On the other hand, *vernehmen* means to interrogate a witness, to call him to account, and thus to comprehend the state of affairs, to determine and set fast how things are going and how things stand" (GA40:146/146). Perception (*Wahrnehmung*) exhibits precisely this double-structure: perception arrests or apprehends that which is perceived for examination such that its own features can be discerned, thus: "perception is a receiving *having-before-oneself* of something given" (GA34:147).

Perception is a mode of unconcealment insofar as it allows entities to be encountered according to an understanding of their being. In so doing, the perceiver understands the perceived as occurrent and in terms of its present features, rather than as simply fulfilling a function, and encounters it as such. But perception (*Wahrnehmung*) is also interrogation (*Vernehmung*) insofar as it unconceals entities as having determinate features through holding them up for interrogative examination and thus drawing them out of utilization.

David Batho

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA2:28, 34, 45, 83, 84, 130, 131, 147, 149, 195, 198, 199, 217, 227, 228, 296, 354, 443, 458, 464, 469, 530. GA22: 78, 98, 109, 110, 115, 116, 118–23, 129, 132, 192, 208, 209, 211, 242, 246, 254, 260, 266–8, 270–73, 277, 278, 292, 308, 310; GA24:64–66, 77–80, 83–85, 88, 89, 94, 95, 97–100, 149, 150, 155, 159, 165, 166, 172, 181, 445, 447, 448; GA34:101–03, 164–69, 171, 174, 176–80, 183, 185, 187, 192, 199, 200, 202, 204–10, 219, 224, 229–33, 240, 241, 243, 244, 270, 298, 299, 307, 310, 322

FURTHER READING

Wrathall 2017a

PERDURANCE (*AUSTRAG*). SEE DISPOSITION.

PERFORMANCE (*VOLLZUG*). SEE ACTUALIZATION.

PERVADING (IN ITS SWAY) (*WALTEN*). SEE PREVAILING.

PERVASIVENESS (*WALTEN*). SEE PREVAILING.

154.
PHENOMENOLOGY (*PHÄNOMENOLOGIE*)

PHENOMENOLOGY IS A branch of philosophical research founded and established by Edmund Husserl in the beginning of the twentieth century. The characteristic traits of the phenomenological movement can be found in the slogan "Back to the things themselves!" This slogan combines three tendencies: (1) a thorough affirmation of what actually needs to be considered – the character and structure of our actual engagement with the world around us (thus many of the preoccupations are exposed as pseudo-problems); (2) a turning away from history-bound and thus tradition- or school-dependent philosophizing (e.g., neo-Kantianism); and (3) an anti-reductionism that defends the rehabilitation of the entirety of human LIVED EXPERIENCE against scientific reductionism. But beyond these tendencies, there is a great deal of disagreement over the character of phenomenology. The method of getting access to the things themselves is as controversial among phenomenologists as the question of what these "things" actually are.

Heidegger can be regarded as part of the phenomenological movement between approximately 1917 and 1929/30. Thus his approach to phenomenology must be acquired from a broad variety of sources, using works from the *entire* period. Ab initio, it is essential that Husserl's idea of phenomenology bears no relevance for Heidegger. In Heidegger's eyes, Husserl had only achieved the very first breakthrough of phenomenology (GA62:365; GA64:17; GA17:1, 62, 302; GA20:108; SZ 38; cf. GA9:34f./29f.); "attempts" and "first results" should nevertheless not be confused with the "real tendency" of phenomenology (GA63:110). Heidegger considered it more important to keep to the "potential" of phenomenology rather than to its "reality" (i.e., what Husserl had made of it; see GA63:74; SZ 38). As early as 1917, Heidegger emphasized in a letter that he could not accept Husserl's phenomenology as "a final position" (*Endgültigkeit*, Heidegger 2005a, 57/33). As he put it in his lectures on *Plato's Sophist*, Heidegger considered it a mark of the seriousness or sincerity of philosophers that they are ready to depart from the established doctrines of their philosophical schools, and become a "parricide" by entirely shaking the teachings of their teacher (GA19:241).

Thus, right from the beginning, Heidegger's avowal of phenomenology needs to be perceived as an intense struggle over the "idea" behind phenomenology, a struggle that so far has not been sufficiently reappraised. Heidegger's own idea of phenomenology can best be reconstructed by examining his criticism of Husserl, which focuses on Husserl's

- fatal and unreflective dependency on *tradition*
- fixation on a specific *ideal* of knowledge (absolute certitude)
- focus on the phenomena of *theoretical* knowledge and experience (e.g., acts of consciousness)
- unquestioning stipulation of traditional ways of thinking (subject–object dichotomy, inside-world–outside-world, layered ontology, considering humans and objects to be isolated entities)

 – bypassing everyday occurrences, the neighbor, and the life-world
 – naive reliance on *techniques* (transcendental reduction, eidetic intuition)

Heidegger agrees with Husserl that some tendencies need to be avoided by phenomenology, in particular playing around with witty *constructions* that he refers to as "free-floating," i.e., that lack an actual "place in life" (Hermann Gunkel), an inclination often found in philosophy (GA63:81; GA17:102; GA19:586f.; GA20:104; GA24:231; SZ 28; GA26:157). The same applies to a phenomenological anti-reductionism that defends phenomena against sciences by claiming to possess the only reliable power of interpretation (GA22:115; cf. GA56/57:73ff.) – a tendency that can also be found in Heidegger's late work. In his early work, Heidegger considered science to mainly operate with a problematic method of isolating single entities from the holistic context in which they can be observed in everyday life (GA23:21ff.).

More revealing, though, are the discrepancies between Heidegger and Husserl. For instance, Husserl had no real interest in the history of philosophy. Consequently, his awareness of problems in this field was less profound than it could have been. Heidegger's broader knowledge of the history of philosophy (especially concerning antiquity and the Middle Ages) enabled him to maintain a more critical distance from philosophical traditions. Here, two aspects were essential to him.

(1) The "historylessness of phenomenology" (GA63:75) is a fundamental problem for Heidegger, because a phenomenology unreflective of history not only relies on specific traditional prejudices concerning specific topics; it also adopts basic pre-decisions concerning how to ask questions (method of research), which questions to raise (choice of topics), and how to split up the questions (philosophical branches) (GA61:99, 174f.; GA62:178f.; GA63:73ff., 81; GA64:40, 87ff.; GA19:9f., 16; GA20:108, 129, 178; GA21:33; GA24:3, 31; GA26:197). According to Heidegger, the philosophical past should not be assumed to be irrelevant to contemporary problems, but rather as present and reverberating throughout them (GA9:5/4, 33f./28f.; GA19:10f., 229). Without taking history's important influence into account and carefully re-examining it from case to case, philosophizing remains uncritical and lacks independence. In this context, Heidegger believed phenomenology to be a promising field, because it offers the opportunity "to raise and answer scientific questions within the field of philosophy" (GA19:9) instead of simply continuing the work of academic predecessors.

(2) Heidegger asked that phenomenology always undertake a *review* he described as "asking for the original, fundamental correlations of existence" (GA64:39) or as "going back to the original motives of explication" (GA63:368; cf. GA9:3/2–3). The primary goal of the phenomenologist is to achieve a "true closeness to things" (GA18:22, cf. 240) and to gain knowledge through "primary, original thing-experience" (GA17:16). This original thing-experience gets lost or obscured in the course of the philosophical tradition. And yet without an awareness of that tradition, philosophical outcomes are passed on "free-floatingly," i.e., by simple "hearsay" (GA63:5; GA64:29), lacking an actual personal view. Overall, the history of philosophy thus appears to undergo an inevitable process of degeneration: "What has once been primarily construed and comprehended degenerates to ordinary common understanding" (GA64:102. Cf. GA62:366; GA63:75f.; GA64:34ff., 102; GA20:119, 375; SZ 19, 28, 36). Heidegger believes that most original philosophical intellectual creations took place in antiquity, especially in the work of Aristotle (GA62:124; GA63:76; GA19:14f.; GA22:22; GA29/30:53).

In order to achieve the reassurance desired by phenomenology, Heidegger deems necessary an extensive "destruction" of the tradition, repeatedly proclaiming it as a program, though he never actually enforces it (GA9:3ff./2ff., 34/27; GA59:29f.; GA60:292; GA61:141; GA62:368f.; GA63:75; GA64:103f.; GA17:117ff.; GA19:413f.; GA24:31; SZ 22f., 26, 39, 392; GA26:197; GA29/30:511; GA31:161, 292). Husserl, on the other hand, thought it possible to liberate himself from the prejudices of the tradition through "epoché" and "transcendental reduction," not considering though that these techniques are themselves permeated by traditional elements unverified by phenomenology. In contrast, Heidegger explains that a "pure" phenomenology is impossible and instead emphasizes modest expectations and patient, laborious detailed work: "not unprejudiced, which is utopian.... Not free of prejudices, but open to the possibility of giving up a prejudice in the right moment by dealing with the thing itself" (GA17:2, cf. 175). Therefore, a liberation from prejudices can only occur on a case-by-case basis and not abruptly, e.g., with the help of some kind of technique (GA56/57:98; GA61:99; GA17:175; GA19:413f.; GA20:36f.; GA21:279f.). Heidegger even put forward this opinion after his actual phenomenological period was completed (GA43:252; GA12:123/OWL 36).

Another central aspect of Heidegger's criticism of Husserl concerns the methodical question whether the material or the ideal of knowledge should be *primary*. Husserl cultivates the *ideal*, making high demands concerning phenomenological knowledge and stipulating scientific sincerity, absolute evidence, apodictism, and certitude. Heidegger, on the other hand, sides with the *material* of knowledge, the "things themselves." Thus, he rejects any scientific paragons, especially considering mathematics – Husserl's hidden love – not to be authoritative for phenomenology (GA58:137; GA63:17, 71f.; GA64:97f.; GA17:103; GA19:24; GA29/30:23ff.). He believes that phenomenology suffers when aligned toward formal ideas such as "absolute bindingness," "indubitability," or "validity." The material becomes secondary in such a context right from the outset; it is taken into consideration only so far as it satisfies the presupposed ideal of knowledge, leading to a merely partial consideration (GA17:102, 207; GA20:246; GA23:142). Instead, Heidegger asks whether a certain approach to knowledge concerning a thing is *appropriate* or *inappropriate* (GA61:166; GA17:102; GA23:139), recognizing that not every approach is suitable for every thing. The kind of approach depends rather on the specific characteristics of the thing (GA56/57:181; GA63:47; GA64:17; SZ 27), i.e., the theory has to accord with the phenomenon, not vice versa (GA24:87). Herein lies Heidegger's original interpretation of "objectivity": the thing itself is always decisive, and phenomenology has to approach it with scientific virtues like openness and dedication (GA56/57:61; GA58:137; GA61:164; GA22:29). Due to the specific role of "objectivity" in Heidegger's conception, he also takes Husserl's slogan "Back to the things themselves" far more seriously than any other representative of phenomenology (e.g., GA64:17; GA17:102; GA21:32f.; SZ 28). In historical regard, Husserl orients himself toward Descartes, while Heidegger tends toward Aristotle (*Nicomachean Ethics* I.1; *De partibus animalium* A1). Thus, Heidegger's repeated criticism of Descartes often – openly or hiddenly – aims at Husserl (GA64:97ff.; GA17:206ff., 254, 271; GA20:139, 147, 247; GA23:138ff.; GA24:175f.; SZ 24f., 45f., 95ff., 211, cf. 442).

In his analysis of Husserl, Heidegger develops an *anti-theoretical affect* (GA56/57:59, 87f.; GA58:39; GA59:131; GA60:208; GA61:98, 153; GA62:115; GA9:22/19, 34f./29f.; GA17:271; GA20:254). In this context, theorization stands for an alienation through indifference, a plainly neutral reflection that abrogates any affective involvement in a meaningful event. This leads to two alternative approaches: Heidegger put forward his concept of "being-in-the-world" against

Husserl's idea of phenomenology as the science of consciousness and "true immanent philosophy" (Husserl 1984, 219). Instead of remaining constrained to offer theoretical statements, Heidegger first focuses on "self-relation," later on "care." On the one hand, he wishes to thus overcome Husserl's explicitly and implicitly prevailing concept of consciousness as an inner world (regardless of his emphasis on intentionality); simultaneously, he straightens out the neglect of practical dealings with the world by emphasizing personal participation ("care"). With that said, phenomenology is for Heidegger – unlike in Husserl's concept – "not an immanent perception with a theoretical aim, directed towards finding existing 'mental' conditions of process and acts" (GA9:31/27).

Thus, through Heidegger a serious alternative to the official image of phenomenology arose within the phenomenological movement and in close vicinity to Husserl. Husserl came late to the realization that his own assistant and academic successor had arguably become the harshest critic of his concept of phenomenology. When the founder of phenomenology vehemently opposed Heidegger's criticisms, Heidegger refused any further debate and parted with the phenomenological movement (GA32:40).

Heidegger always considered phenomenology as something formal, as a "manner of research" (GA63:71), an "operating principle" (GA21:32), or a "concept of a method" (GA24:27), though this has not been documented as explicitly and frequently as in the case of Husserl. A pivotal demand is that phenomenology vividly bring the things to view, but only discuss them in as far as the things show themselves from themselves – a principle that was trivially obvious in Heidegger's eyes, but nevertheless commonly neglected within philosophy (GA63:71). Besides the criticism we've noted so far, Heidegger's most important contribution to phenomenology was his turn to hermeneutics (SZ 37f.). In this, he ties in with Wilhelm Dilthey, while also going beyond him, when he declares hermeneutics to be an "existential understanding" aiming toward an interpretation of the "world of experience" – in particular, of the "factical life-experience" (GA63:18; GA58:92; GA59:36; GA61:2). Heidegger thereby changes the focus of phenomenological practice *from perception to interpretation*. Heidegger polemically calls perception, cultivated by both Husserl and Max Scheler, "pure perception" (SZ 138), plain "staring" (GA20:350; GA29/30: 338), or "gaping" (SZ 61; GA25:21). In contrast, interpretation is always circumspective, i.e., it reveals the significance of an encounter by identifying something as something (GA26:159). In this way, Heidegger becomes a pioneer in "epistemic explication" (Hermann Schmitz). Fixating mostly on ontological topics, the subsequent reception of Heidegger's work surprisingly has neither acknowledged nor productively continued Heidegger's critical revision of phenomenology.

Michael Großheim

PHENOMENON (*PHÄNOMEN*). SEE PHENOMENOLOGY.

PHENOMENON (*ERSCHEINUNG*). SEE APPEARANCE.

PHRASE (*SATZ*). SEE PRINCIPLE.

PHUSIS. SEE EMERGENCE.

PLACE (*RAUM*). SEE SPACE.

155.
PLACE (*ORT/ORTSCHAFT*)

A PLACE IS A bounded and yet open domain or "region" (*Gegend*) of gathering and disclosure, and thus has an essential connection to "BOUNDARY" or "limit" (*Grenze*) as well as to "openness" and the OPEN (*das Offene*). Heidegger uses "place" (which can translate both *Ort* and *Ortschaft*) in this specific and significant ontological sense in his later work. There are, however, two senses of place at work here (deriving from the two German terms). In one sense, the emphasis is on place as an open domain *gathered* within its bounds (this is the sense associated with *Ort* – Heidegger notes, at GA12:33/OWL 159, the term's original meaning as referring to the point of a spear). In the other sense, the emphasis is on the *openness* within the gathering bounds (this is the sense associated with *Ortschaft*). The difference between these two senses is reflected in the difference between place, in its more mundane usage, as referring to a particular spot or location (*Ort*) or to a broader locality (an area, village, or town – *Ortschaft*).

In its ontological sense, "place" stands in close proximity to ALÊTHEIA and CLEARING (*Lichtung*), as well as to the FOURFOLD (*das Geviert*), ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*), and the THING (*das Ding*), as well as DASEIN. Place (*Ort*) is also at issue in the term *Erörterung*, which in ordinary German means a "discussion," but which Heidegger uses in a way that draws attention to *Erörterung* as a "placing" and putting in place, or a "saying of place" (and so as connected with "TOPOLOGY") (see GA9:385–426/291–322; GA12:33/OWL 159–60). Heidegger's focus on place in the later thinking brings with it an explicit sense of the difference between place and SPACE, and an emphasis on place over space so that: "spaces [*Räume*] receive their ESSENCE [*ihr Wesen*] from places [*aus Orten*] and not from space [*dem Raum*]" (GA7:156/PLT 152; GA13:206–10/HR 307–09 – but see also GA40:70–71/69–70). In the "Le Thor Seminar" Heidegger identifies three stages or markers on the path of thinking that seem to correspond to three stages in his own thought, of which the third is place – (the other two are MEANING and TRUTH) – and which Heidegger then connects with the idea of THINKING as a topology of BEYNG (*Topologie des Seyns*) which can in turn be understood as a "saying" of the "place of beyng" (*Ortschaft des Seyns*; see GA15:355, 344/FS 41, 47). Although the explicit appearance of place (and so of *Ort* and *Ortschaft*) in its ontological sense is largely restricted, in its philosophically significant usage, to the later thinking alone (when it does appear in the earlier thinking, e.g., in discussion of the "'place' of truth," "*Ort*" *der Wahrheit*, SZ 226, place is not itself directly thematized), ideas and images of place are at work throughout Heidegger's writings.

The way in which place appears, however, is often complicated, sometimes problematic, and involves a variety of terms and a range of contexts. Notions of place are clearly at work in *Being and Time*: in the idea of the "place" (*Platz*) that belongs to an item of EQUIPMENT as it is located within an equipmental "region" (*Gegend*, SZ 102; Heidegger also uses "SITE" or "position" (*Stelle*) to refer to the location of a piece of equipment in space); in the oriented structure of existential spatiality (*existenziale Räumlichkeit*) as distinct from mere spatial extendedness; in Dasein's essential capacity for nearness (*Nähe*); in the idea of the hermeneutic "situation"

(*Situation*); and in the THERE (*Da*) of Da-sein itself. It is only with Heidegger's rethinking of *Being and Time* (and especially his rethinking of the associated concepts of WORLD and of existential spatiality) coupled with his explicit engagement with Hölderlin from the mid-1930s onward (and perhaps also his failed political involvement with the Nazi party from 1931–34) – that Heidegger begins to develop a more integrated and explicit account of place. That account emerges in its most developed form in the period from the "Letter on 'Humanism'" onward, and by the early 1950s, place (*Ort*) and locale (*Ortschaft*) appear as part of a complex constellation of topological terms (including the idea of "DWELLING," *Wohnen*) that lie at the very heart of Heidegger's thinking – notions that Heidegger himself warns us cannot be treated as mere metaphors (see GA5:358/272). Even the idea of *Ge-Stell* (variously translated as "enframing," "framework," "composition," "positionality," "SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT(ION)ING," and the "inventory") carries topological connotations, especially through its relation to *stellen* (to install, to posit, or to position), *Stelle* (position), and *setzen* (to set) – terms which Heidegger relates back to the Greek *thesis* (GA5:70–71/53). Under the sway of *Ge-Stell*, place becomes mere position – *Ort* is reduced to *Stelle*.

<div align="right">

Jeff Malpas

</div>

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA5:66/50, 273/203; GA7:156–62/PLT 154–57; GA9:385–426/291–322; GA10:106/60; GA12:33/ OWL 159–60; GA13:84/PLT 12; GA13:206–10/HR 307–09; GA15:355, 344/FS 41, 47; GA19:105–11/72–76; GA40:70–71/69–70; GA53:31/27, 35/30, 42/35, 51–53/42–44, 58–60/47–49, 65–67/52–54, 100/81, 203/166; GA54:132–33/89–90, 141–42/95–96, 175–76/118–19, 209–210/ 141; GA65:329–30, 359

FURTHER READING

Casey 1997, Elden 2002, Fell 1979, Malpas 2006, Malpas 2012, Nitsche 2013, Schatzki 2007

156.
PLAYING FORTH (*ZUSPIEL*)

P LAYING FORTH IS the playful reciprocity or "interplay" between the "first beginning" or INCEPTION of Western thinking and the "other beginning" that is "forth"-coming for thinking.

The term is employed by Heidegger especially in *Contributions to Philosophy* (GA65). "The Playing Forth" is the title of the third section of *Contributions* (*Beiträge*), which was composed between 1936 and 1938. In this section (GA65:167–224), Heidegger seeks to show how there is a (playful) movement and mutuality of thinking between the earliest Greek thinking of *phusis* and *alêtheia*, the "first beginning," and the "other beginning" that is drawing the human being into thoughtful preparation for a renewed understanding and experience of BEYNG (*Seyn*). This "playing-forth" is more sketched than worked out in great detail in this text; nonetheless, the broad lines of his notion can be discerned. The earliest Greek thinking of *phusis* and *alêtheia* was a momentous breakthrough to the thinking of beyng, yet by degrees, this fundamental thinking was narrowed to a thinking of the BEINGNESS of entities, thus inaugurating the metaphysical epoch of the thinking of the being(ness) of entities (see HISTORY OF BEING). The earliest Greek names for beyng – *phusis* and *alêtheia* – were transformed in this devolution or disempowering of thinking. At the onset of the metaphysical age, *phusis* was leveled down to refer to the constant presence of an entity (its "ESSENCE"), and ALÊTHEIA, originally experienced as the truthing (emergence, showing-forth, manifestness) of beyng itself, became identified with "truth" as the proper comportment and activity of the human knower.

In the late 1930s, Heidegger was especially concerned with highlighting the salient features of the many thinkers in the metaphysical tradition of thinking from Plato to Nietzsche. All these thinkers, in his view, offered only variations on the "guiding question" that dominated metaphysics: what is the being(ness) of entities? None were able to attain to the "fundamental question" regarding the being/beyng of the being(ness) of entities that was originally glimpsed by the earliest Greek thinkers but subsequently covered over and largely lost from view. For Heidegger, playing-forth characterizes the "delightful" recognition and consideration that the fundamental matter (*die Sache selbst*) regarding beyng, which is calling to us in the present age, is the very same matter that had originarily come into the view of the earliest Greeks and been named by them in their distinctive manner. The promise of the "other beginning" is at the same time the retrieval of the "first beginning," and the retrieval of the "first beginning" is at the same time the preparation for the ushering in of the "other beginning."

The term "playing forth" is largely confined to Heidegger's private *Ereignis*-manuscripts of the late 1930s, but the core idea, in one form or another, remained central to his later thinking. For example, in his well-known lecture "Time and Being" in 1962, he concludes the lecture by remarking that what he had been attempting to say about being as *Ereignis* (ADAPTATION) and as *Es gibt* is only another way of saying what the earliest Greeks had gathered in the name *a-lêtheia*. Thus in his own words from the lecture: "yet what if we take

what has been said and adopt it unceasingly as the guide for our thinking, and consider that this same (*dieses Selbe*) is not even anything new, but rather the oldest of the old (*das Älteste des Alten*) in Western thinking: the primordially old that conceals itself in the name *A-letheia*? From out of which – this originary source that generates all leitmotifs of thinking – speaks a binding that binds all thinking, provided that thinking submits to the behest of what is to be thought" (GA14:29).

<div align="right">

Richard Capobianco

</div>

PLIGHT (*NOT*). SEE EMERGENCY.

157.
POETRY (*DICHTUNG*)

THE GERMAN WORD *Dichtung* is broader in meaning than the term "poetry" and names different literary productions, including novels and plays. The verb *dichten* means "to compose." Heidegger expands on the meanings of this term and uses it in, at least, four different senses, which are interconnected and overlapping with each other. "Poetry" can name: (1) literary composition – what he calls "great poetry" (*grosse Dichtung*), (2) ART in general, (3) the genuine character of LANGUAGE, before it is used as a natural language, and (4) a "configuration" in the sense that things become relevant and thus meaningful insofar as they are "poetized" (*gedichtet*) or configured within a framework.

These different senses of poetry are closely linked to Heidegger's many efforts to find an access to the question of BEING beyond what traditional ontology permits. Poetry thus does not name something specific, such as literary composition or language or the work by a poet. It rather names a process of invention, after which something is "composed" as salient, relevant, or meaningful, which it was not before. This differentiation or this composition consists of a configuration that takes the form of a "thought" or an "insight." The fourth meaning of "configuration" is the broadest and the most powerful sense to the extent that poetry does something that traditionally "THINKING" alone is supposed to do: to draw distinctions, to make connections, to carve out a chunk of meaningfulness into a recognizable entity such as a judgment or a thought or a proposition.

This sense of poetry as configuration and thus as a competitor to thinking is linked to the second sense of poetry as characterizing art in general. In "The Origin of the Work of Art" we are told that art is a setting-into-work of the TRUTH, which makes *Dichtung* a direct dealing with the truth, like thinking. "*All art*, as the letting happen of the advent of the truth of what is, is, as such, *essentially poetry* [*Dichtung*]" (GA5:59/PLT 72). Clearly, the truth in question is not about well-established entities, such as judgments or propositions, but is rather disclosure, as the rising into saliency or the coming into prominence. Even when Heidegger specifically deals with poetry in the narrow sense – the first sense as literary composition – he rejects as insufficient the approaches of philology and literary criticism, precisely because poetry is not contained in the text per se, but in the saying of the poem (GA39:256).

The saying is indeed the key. If "configuration" is the broadest sense of poetry, the link to language – the third sense of poetry as original saying – is the most crucial aspect: language is the means of the configuration and what "gives" things their being in the sense that it lets them enter into being.

Three main stages can be distinguished in the evolution of Heidegger's views on poetry: *Being and Time*, the 1930s, and the late philosophy. In *Being and Time* poetry is mentioned only occasionally. When discussing "DISCOURSE," which is one of the main three existentials or components of EXISTENCE, Heidegger indicates that the fourth component of discourse, "announcement," can be made the object of poetic discourse: "in 'poetical' discourse, the communication of the existential possibilities of one's DISPOSEDNESS can become an aim in

itself, and this amounts to a disclosing of existence" (SZ 162). Poetry is on the side of "situatedness" and offers "documents" to phenomenological investigation, but seems to lack a proper "authentic" understanding. Although he characterizes poetry in the *Fundamental Problems of Phenomenology* as "the fundamental coming-into-word of the thing" (GA24:244), in the same work he also criticizes Rilke's poetry for being inauthentic in the sense that in his poetry "Dasein understands itself at first and usually from things" (GA24:410).

It is in the 1930s that poetry takes center stage in Heidegger's philosophy. Poetry is even the exclusive topic of a lecture course in 1934–35 on Hölderlin. While commentators usually speak of a "turn" (*Kehre*) after *Being and Time*, we can also consider with Gadamer that there are several turns in Heidegger's itinerary that are not necessarily radical breaks, but significant reorientations of his thought. A general description of the turn in the 1930s can be put succinctly thus: in *Being and Time* Dasein is characterized as a clearing (*Lichtung*) in the sense that human existence is the place where things are disclosed, always being "for" something and ultimately "for the sake of" Dasein. In the 1930s another clearing is introduced in the sense that the first clearing that human existence is finds itself made possible or disclosed within another clearing, which Heidegger calls the truth of being or the history of being or the *Ereignis* of being (see Adaptation) – these expressions are not necessarily equivalent. It is a transition from the sense of being to the truth of being: "The sense [*Sinn*] (see *Being and Time*), i.e., . . . the truth of beyng" (GA65:43).

This remarkable shift in 1934–35 has puzzled many readers and led some of them to see Heidegger moving away from philosophy with its concerns for human affairs into a flight of fancy or a form of "linguicism" (Apel 1963, 88), as a break with the "fundamental ontology" of *Being and Time* (Taminiaux 1989b), as a proof that Heidegger had broken with his political illusions of the Rectorate (Dallmayr 1986), or as a confirmation of the political connections of his ontology (Lacoue-Labarthe 2007b). All of these interpretations can summon good and convincing arguments on the basis of telling passages in Heidegger.

In Heidegger's views, poetry is supposed to provide thinking with a new ambit, not only, and obviously, away from thinking understood traditionally as an account given in terms of arguments and reasons, and not only away from an existentially finite and historically situated human being. Poetry names the very configuration of thinking, the fact that thinking itself is "made" and produced, historically situated, thus not rigid and fixed in a logic or set of valid reasonings. It names the "poetic" aspect of thought or the fact that there is a "poetics of thinking."

The need for this poetics of thinking results from what Heidegger perceived to be the limits of the "existential" reflection operative in *Being and Time*. When Dasein is encompassed within another clearing, there is a need for a new angle and new resources in order to talk about what exceeds the realm of what is significant or salient to human beings. What truth as disclosure adds to Dasein as disclosure is the historical dimension. In the 1930s history is no longer a feature of existence, as presented in *Being and Time*, but the blind spot of existence, as what makes it what it is, but cannot be clarified, objectified, or elucidated within existence. As the title *Being and Time* already indicated, Heidegger was acutely aware of how the question of history complicates the question of being. However, he leaves it to a question at the end of the book: "is there a way which leads from primordial time to the meaning of being? Does Time itself manifest itself as the horizon of being?" (SZ 437). Being can certainly not be a logical question of possibility, but no longer can it be an existential condition of possibility, along the lines of what we find in *Being and Time*. Being belongs to the historical conditions of possibility.

However, the new problem now is that, although being can no longer be confined to a framework where the center of gravity is what human beings can understand, human beings are still those doing the investigation as those who speak and write.

This radical opening of the historical dimension in Heidegger's ontology leads him to speak of a disclosure of being that is part and parcel of being itself, as it were. It is not being that is disclosed as if it were something, but the disclosure allows something to be, to enter into being. Being "is" disclosure or the truth of being, opening up history and thus the "history of being." The challenge for Heidegger is to find a way of speaking that is still from within human existence and concerns, but not taking its reference in human existence and concerns.

This is why language takes a more and more prominent place in Heidegger's thought. Already in *Being and Time* discourse (*Rede*) was one of the three main existentials as what articulates the meaningfulness of the world and is, as such, at the basis of language as a mode of expression. Once Heidegger broadens BEING-IN-THE-WORLD to a historical situatedness, language gains the prominence of what keeps together the being-in-the-world and the place where history has sedimented in the very words we use. Because language is that which gives a public status to things, Heidegger saw a deep connection between language, history, and things. "The word, as it were, grants to each thing as a being . . . the means to be" (GA12:177/OWL 82). This historical thickness of language cannot be reduced to a conscious intention instantiated by a singular subject. However, language is not reified as another form of consciousness that would speak through Dasein as a voice-over or an "unconscious," undermining from within what subjects say.

Heidegger came to exploit this "a-subjective" thickness of language in many different ways through plays on words (*was heisst Denken* means both "what thinking is called" and "what calls for thinking"), etymologies (the famous *a-lêtheia* as privation of concealment), disfigurement of usual words (*Ent-fernung* meaning DIS-STANCE and used to mean the removal of distance). This productive use of language in order to describe what made possible our normal use of concepts and language is very close to a literary invention and is a form of poetry as "configuration." As we can read in a course on Aristotle of 1931, language is "that wherein the openness and the power of announcement [*Kundschaft*] of the world first of all bursts forth and is. Language, therefore, originally and authentically occurs in poetry [*Dichtung*] – however, not poetry in the sense of the occupation of writers, but poetry as the proclamation of world in the invocation of the god" (GA33:128–29/AM 109; translation modified).

This productive use of language – a *Dichtung* of thought in the sense of a poetics of thinking – is only the correlate of a receptive side. It is because the event happens – the truth discloses itself – that there is an aftermath of thinking. Poetry cannot thus simply be configuration. It is more fundamentally a response. Thus, the specificity of poetry is precisely to be this in-between, between productive configuration and productive reception.

Interestingly, these two aspects are pointed out by Heidegger himself when he examines the origins of the word *Dichtung*. The word is connected to the Greek POIÊSIS, "production," as its conceptual origin, and to the Old High German *tithon*, which comes from the Latin *dictare*, frequentative of *dicere*, "to say," which counts as its linguistic origin (GA39:29). Although these conceptual and linguistic origins do not reveal much, Heidegger sees a connection between the Latin *dicere* and the Greek *deiknumi*, which means "to show." *Dichtung* is a "showing," a "sign-giving" (GA39:29), which, as indicated by *dictare*, points to the receptive power of poetry. Already in *Being and Time* poetry was on the side of showing how human beings are affected.

What poetry now suggests is that there is a dictation, a first saying of what poetry responds to and transmits. This receptive power is eminently articulated in the course on Hölderlin in 1934–35.

It is no coincidence that Heidegger's turn to poetry goes with a fascination for Hölderlin's poetry, for his poems as well as the type of discourse he creates. Hölderlin gives Heidegger an opportunity and, more importantly, the means to speak in a non-metaphysical and a-subjective manner of "what is," thus beyond the traditional ontology of TRUTH and object, but still within the human sphere of what makes sense to human beings. This influence of Hölderlin can be broken down into three contributions that Hölderlin makes to Heidegger's effort to find the voice for the history of being.

The first contribution is in Hölderlin's poems. He is the poet of the poets (GA4:34/52) and he offers to Heidegger insights that give traction to some of Heidegger's own hunches and ideas. Hölderlin's magnetic formulations and mesmerizing suggestions respond to what Heidegger is looking for. Statements such as "but what remains, the poet founds" (GA4:144/165) or "Is there a measure on earth? There is none" (GA7:198/PLT 220) suggest another voice within human discourse without another intention being reified beyond human intentions. Hölderlin calls it metaphorically the "voice of the gods" as what can only resound in the voice of the poet. These suggestive formulations help Heidegger unfold them by recasting them in a more "philosophical" tone, using those formulations as a scaffolding, as it were.

The second contribution of Hölderlin is the fact that poetry as a configuration is a process or activity within language and thought. It is the productive moment or the *energeia* as *en-ergon* – entering-into-work – that transforms language or poetry in the narrow sense into a process of easing something out of the magma of the possibles and into a specific concatenation of words naming a "thought" or "idea," thereby allowing that "something" to "be." Poetry is "the foundation of being in words" (*worthafte Stiftung des Seins*, GA4:42/59). This was already the traditional gesture of phenomenology whose aim is not only to be descriptive, but also to lead readers and listeners to a transformation of their gaze so that they come to see for themselves what the phenomenologist is pointing to. As the phenomenological method does, the speaking aims at a conversion of the perspective. Thanks to Hölderlin, Heidegger can grant this function to language itself: it is a poetry as a setting-into-work, in the sense of bringing into sayability what was not relevant or salient before. As a result, language is no mere external appendage to a thing, but is rather the flesh of things as what allows them to be presentable as such or what grants them being. As Heidegger says, "the word gives – being" (GA12:182/OWL 88).

The third contribution of Hölderlin is to give Heidegger the angle needed in order to make clear how poetry can be the articulation of that which comes beforehand, what is given and addressed to human beings, but in a manner that is only intelligible in the way human beings respond. Hölderlin names this active receptivity a "grounding mood" or "fundamental disposition" (*Grundstimmung*). This gives Heidegger the notion of a movement back and forth between reception and production, away from the traditional notions of passivity and activity. The fundamental disposition is receptive as a disposition or a MOOD (*Stimmung*), but productive as a foundation.

This notion of grounding mood (*Grundstimmung*) sounds very Heideggerian in itself as *Being and Time* speaks of *Stimmungen* or moods as a manifestation in human existence of the basic feature of what it means to exist: to be situated or to find oneself in a specific situation (DISPOSEDNESS, *Befindlichkeit*). The way we are affected, touched, concerned by things and

other people manifests itself in the different moods we may be in. Heidegger uses the notion of grounding mood no longer to name a mood as in *Being and Time*, but something that seizes the whole of existence and gives it its coloring or its basic bearings. Such a broader power of the mood was already suggested in *Being and Time* as the mood of ANXIETY (*Angst*), which shakes and unsettles the whole of human existence, revealing its "insignificance" (*Unbedeutsamkeit*, SZ 186). With Hölderlin's contribution, the mood reaches beyond an existential condition and becomes ontological through and through, as affecting the whole manner in which a PEOPLE inhabits its WORLD or has a world.

Heidegger gives two examples of grounding moods in this ontological sense. In the first beginning in the Greek world, the grounding mood was wonder or astonishment, *thaumazein*. This wonder is not a psychological state of mind, such as being in awe, but a radical disruption of a people's mental attitudes: everything that was taken for granted, nicely fitting into a referring network of things, was struck with a question mark: why are things the way they are? For the world as it goes, this fundamental disposition was madness, as Heidegger illustrates it with the story of Thales falling into a well and ridiculed by a maid or as Heidegger glorifies it with Hölderlin's fall into insanity ("the protection offered by the night of madness," GA4:42/59). The fundamental disposition or grounding mood of wonder is thus not a psychological state or attitude, but a complete loss of grip on the world as it goes. Being fundamentally affected or disposed means being struck by an event and the response became the beginning of the Western tradition. To this mood of the first beginning or INCEPTION, Heidegger tells us, there corresponds a different fundamental mood for the other inception, in transition toward which he argues we are, in our era of MACHINATION and TECHNOLOGY. The mood of that other beginning is terror (*Erschrecken*). What seizes us and permeates our very being in the age of machination is the terror that things are (the way they are).

Because it is not psychological, such a fundamental mood first strikes human beings and puts them in the position of recipients, at the accusative, as Levinas would say. This mood is disruptive in the positive sense of displacing human beings away from the position of control. With the grounding mood the change of perspective has been effectuated away from a subject who thinks to a subject who is unsettled in its subjectivity, but must respond in some way. Hölderlin's *Dichtung* and poetry understood by Heidegger as the thinking seized by a fundamental disposition are thus this speaking that is not to be understood in subjective terms, as originating from a subject and directed at another subject. It is a speaking that responds to this fundamental affection and effectuates a shift of position in the readers and listeners. It transforms them into those who receive and helps them understand themselves away from the paradigm of subjectivity and into a new paradigm: the in-between. Human beings are now one concretization of what we call human beings. As Count Yorck had already stated, and as Heidegger quotes him in *Being and Time*, "the 'modern human being' – that is to say, the post-Renaissance human being – is ready for burial" (SZ 401). Heidegger's radical version of historical being states that the way we understand ourselves is only one manifestation – historical – of what it means to be human. Our understanding of ourselves is eventful, in the sense of being the result of an event, and it represents our response to a givenness, as a being fundamentally affected, as a productive configuration or poetry. We ourselves are poets (*Dichter*): those who configure as well as those who are configured. We are like Hölderlin as a poet: we are "meant" (GA52:13).

These three contributions coming from Hölderlin allow Heidegger to articulate the thickness of poetry in the multiple senses mentioned at the beginning: literature, art, genuine

language, and configuration. History does not just permeate "what is said," as if history were a mere "context" or a Sartrean existential "situation." History permeates "being" itself: "to be" means "to be historical," seized by history, shaken by the event, thrust in a position from which speaking will arise as a response. When speaking about being, now we speak, as Heidegger creates the expression, within the "history of being." The history of being is not a historiography of being nor about the historical character of being as existing, as existentialists have emphasized, but a shift of perspective on what it means for something or someone to "be": to be means to arise and unfold within history so that the ontological flesh of things and PEOPLE is historical. There is no existence situated in history anymore, as in *Being and Time*, but history inhabiting us so that we are this DWELLING.

In his late thought, Heidegger downplays the notion of the history of being that is so prominent in the 1930s and focuses instead on the manifestation of the historical character of being in language and through language. When Heidegger says that "language speaks" (GA12:243/OWL 124) this does not mean a mere inversion of the subjective pole, replacing the human subject with another kind of subject: language. Rather, it is a complete *Destruktion* of subjectivity, its total destructuring. Language does not exist as an entity that can have intentions or initiatives, but language exists as what permeates our thinking, will, desires, and self-identity. Language is "the house of being" (GA9:313/239).

Language is thus at the origin of poetry as literature, art, and configuration, but fundamentally language itself is poetry: poetry is an "invention," halfway between mere discovery and sheer fabrication. In an *Oberseminar* in 1939 (GA85) Heidegger notes that Herder uses the word *erfinden* to name the fact that human beings "invented" language. It is not obviously a "fabrication" by human beings, but it is not a discovery either. According to Heidegger, *erfinden* as used by Herder means: "to make available [*anfertigen*] something which absolutely did not exist before" (GA85:22). Language as poetry is productive-receptive, configuration, art, and literature. Heidegger can thus say interchangeably that poetry is original language (*Ur-Sprache*, GA4:43/60) and that language is original poetry (*Ur-dichtung*, GA40:180/183) or "the original poetry of humankind" (*Urpoesie der Menschheit*, GA71:262).

There is no contradiction because neither poetry nor language names an entity. They are rather descriptions of processes and these two processes are each diverse in their manifestations: language is linguistic and a configuration of thinking, thus a form of poetry. *Dichtung* is poetry as a literary genre or activity and a configuration that is most striking in poems or art in general, but poetry is also at work in thinking and speaking. Poetry formulates and effectuates the turn away from subjectivity and into a thinking of the event.

Heidegger has always been looking for ways to counter and unmask the logicization of thinking – through a rigid definition of what it means to reason – and of language – through the categories that linguists and philologists have used to dissect language and classify its components. In *Contributions to Philosophy* he makes a stark contrast between what he calls "Thinking I" and "Thinking II" (GA65:457). "Thinking II" is what we usually know by that term: thinking in the form of reasonings and arguments that confer the qualification of "rational." "Thinking I" is what Heidegger considers to be the original form of thinking as the production or the bringing into being of forms of thinking, such as "Thinking II." It is not so much that "Thinking I" "exists" somewhere and is performed as thinking, but rather the view that there is a blind spot in "Thinking II" that calls into question the absolute character of this form of thinking as the only and necessary one. Heidegger suggests the following in *Übungen*

from 1937/38: "To differentiate: 1. 'Thinking' as what in philosophizing is determining in advance; 2. 'Thinking' as the ACTUALIZATION of philosophical REFLECTION" (GA88:11). Poetry is a way to name the presence in "Thinking II" of a productive moment that "Thinking II" cannot recover, but on which it constantly relies. As its blind spot it allows us to question what it means to be rational or what it means to think by pointing out that thinking as a well-delineated activity with accepted rules of argumentation and set of judgments, itself depends on something that "calls for thinking."

What matters is thus to keep these two aspects of thinking and poetry together. Doing so prevents us from succumbing to the sirens of clear and distinct ideas – as if thinking was exclusively conceptual, without its own poetics or historical origin – as well as from falling prey to the temptations of literary excitement, of what Roland Barthes has called "the pleasure of the text" (1975) – as if poems did not also make intellectual claims on us and challenge us conceptually. Maintaining together thinking and poetry becomes an alternative mode of thinking, which – it is Heidegger's wager – may lead us to a more significant conversion: seeing things and the world in their event-character as what has just entered being, what still carries with it its origin and is still rich of its potentialities, still being-historical in the sense of still pregnant with the becoming.

This "dialogue" between thinking and poetry – reuniting philosophy and poetry – prepares an alternative mode of thinking that is a fundamental refocusing of what it means to be a human being and what it means for a thing to be. Regarding human beings, the thinking of the event effectuates a *Destruktion* of subjectivity in the sense of a deconstruction that shows a "historical making" in the very working of subjectivity. The poetics of thinking forces a revision of subjectivity, what the Dasein of *Being and Time* already delegitimized. Human subjects described as being-in-the-world in 1927 are now, in Heidegger's late philosophy, "mortals." They are characterized by their finitude within what Heidegger calls a "FOURFOLD," which also includes the gods, the earth, and the sky. When human beings are taken away from their subjective stance toward the world and themselves, they are dwelling in the world and their mode of dwelling is supposed to be "poetic": they dwell as poets. This means that we are the in-between, where we find our place as human beings assigned to a certain way of dwelling within an event or ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*).

The dialogue between thinking and poetry also reformulates what it means for a thing to be. Instead of being "tools" whose "being" lies in being referred to other things for the sake of Dasein – a hammer is for hammering – things are now part of the same event as human beings. Instead of being clearly delineated entities waiting to be labeled by language and made interesting by poetry, things are *gedichtet*, as Heidegger says about the sun or the wind, which have been "poetized" (*gedichtet*) in a *Dichtung* of astronomy and meteorology (GA52:40). In Heidegger's "wild ontology" things "gather a world," such a gathering being precisely the intersection of productivity and receptivity, of a *poiêsis* and a dictation, of an *ergon* and an *en-energeia*, of a work and a setting-into-work. This is how "things, each in its time, literally visit mortals with a world" (GA12:20/PLT 200).

Pol Vandevelde

FURTHER READING

Apel 1963, Barthes 1975, Dallmayr 1986, Lacoue-Labarthe 2007b, Taminiaux 1989b, Vandevelde 2012

158.
POIÊSIS

P oiêsis is a mode of bringing forth into unconcealment that, in the broadest sense of the term, involves any kind of production and bringing forth, including natural production. As a human activity of "properly productive action," *poiêsis* relies on the separate productive power of nature to create the elements of poetic production (GA19:46). This productive activity is broader than *techne* (handcraft, skill) and includes within it all poetry, ART, and creative production. As bringing forth and production, *poiêsis* posits elements into an arrangement by taking nature as its measure. By the 1930s *poiêsis* becomes a central concept which unites Heidegger's ONTOLOGY with his philosophy of LANGUAGE, TECHNOLOGY, and the environment.

Poiêsis in ancient Greek means fabrication, creation, production, and poetry. In Heidegger's early treatments of the term in his lectures on Aristotle and Plato in the 1920s, he tends to describe *poiêsis* in the narrower sense of production (*hervorbringen*). By the 1930s the term takes on a much broader ontological meaning as he begins to translate *poiêsis* as "to poetize" (*dichten*). Understood as a mode of human comportment and dwelling, poetizing places entities into unconcealment in order to prepare for ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*). Heidegger often refers to this meaning of *poiêsis* using a set of cognate terms such as "poetic" (*dichterisch*), "poem" (*Gedicht*), "poet" (*Dichter*), and "poetry" (*Dichtung*). Poetic language involves the suspension of the propositional structure of language.

Throughout his evolving treatment of *poiêsis*, Heidegger insists that "the basic meaning is to bring forth and to produce" (GA55:366). This does not refer to all modes of bringing forth, but instead to "properly [*eigentlich*] productive action" (GA19:46). Properly productive action seeks "to gather the unconcealed as such" (GA55:369), and stands in contrast to action that does not place entities into unconcealment. As a result of this action, entities placed into unconcealment are there in the Heideggerian sense of being-there. Heidegger describes that process as follows:

> In the context of the fundamental discussion, the sense of being as being present [*Gegenwärtigsein*] receives a more precise elucidation, insofar as we manage to show what the *there* [*Da*] means for the Greeks: *having-come-into-the-there*, and specifically *through pro-duction*; pro: there, pro is toward a determinate there: pro-ducing, bringing into the there, into the present. That is the genuine sense of *poiêsis*. (GA18:214)

Production of this sort does not merely refer to a specific set of actions, nor to the fabrication of particular items through human manipulation (*techne*). Instead, it refers to a manner of DWELL-ING that encompasses one's entire comportment, including how one uses language, interacts with other humans, and uses the resource of the EARTH.

In his 1951 essay on Hölderlin "... Poetically Man Dwells ..." Heidegger explicates most clearly an understanding of poetic (or poietic) dwelling which was already quite prevalent in his lectures on Hölderlin and Nietzsche in the 1930s. While poetic speaking,

acting, and dwelling bring humans into the measure of unconcealment granted by *phusis*, action and comportment that is not poetic destroys unconcealment and treats language, human beings, and the earth as a STANDING RESERVE of resources to be exploited. Hence Heidegger issues the following warning: "one needs to distinguish from this Greek notion of *poiêsis* the modern notion of production, which means: to set into availability" (GA15:392/FS 77). Modern production treats nature and human beings as nothing more than quantifiable supplies of resources which are made available to be consumed without any regard for the measure. Production in the Greek sense of *poiêsis*, in contrast, regards the proper measure of production. As authentically productive action, *poiêsis* "takes *phusis* as its measure" (GA55:367).

Heidegger makes it clear what it means for *poiêsis* as bringing forth to take nature as its measure in a passage from his 1944 Heraclitus seminar which states that even *phusis* is a form of *poiêsis*:

> it is of utmost importance that we think bringing-forth in its full scope and at the same time in the sense which the Greeks thought it. Not only handcraft manufac-ture, not only artistic and poetic bringing into appearance and concrete imagery, is a bringing forth, *poiêsis*. *Phusis* also, the arising of something from out of itself, is a bringing-forth, *poiêsis*. (GA7:14/QCT 10)

These two forms of *poiêsis*, human production and natural production, must be strictly distin-guished ontologically, for while natural production is self-moving, human production is not. *Phusis* thus provides the measure according to which human production places "something into the unhiddenness of its appearance" (GA9:286/221). Heidegger describes this relationship as a form of derivation in which *phusis* provides the measure-giving rule from which humans derive the poetic manner of bringing entities into appearance.

Even as Heidegger vests *poiêsis* with an increasingly complex set of ontological meanings, he also employs it in a more traditional sense to designate poetry and the work of poets. Through poetry humans learn to attend the measure, as Heidegger demonstrates in the following passge:

> Finally if by "art" we mean *what is brought forward in a process of bringing-forth*, what is produced in production, and the producing itself, then the Greek speaks of *poiein* and *poiêsis*. That the word *poiêsis* in the emphatic sense comes to be reserved for designation of the production of something in words, that *poiêsis* "poesy" becomes the special name for the art of the word, poetic creation, testifies to the primacy of such art within Greek art as a whole. (GA6.1:167/N1 165)

Dwelling poetically requires the restoration of this primacy of poetizing. The poetic role of art, therefore, is not to provide a set of pleasant aesthetic experiences, but is instead an encourage-ment to reorient ourselves at a fundamental ontological level. Hence Heidegger writes: "art in the highest sense is *poiêsis* – poesy. It is knowledge, but as knowledge it is the gathering of the unconcealed and the self-gathering into unconcealment" (GA55:369). *Poiêsis* is the production of this self-gathering.

Adam Knowles

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA5:70–72/52–54; GA6.1:167/N1 165; GA9:286/221; GA18:175, 188–89, 321–29; GA19:22, 38–39, 41–49, 271–78; GA55:361, 366–70, 381; GA65:107, 126, 130, 132, 184; GA79:64

FURTHER READING

Bambach 2013, McNeill 1999

POINTER (*WINK*). SEE HINT.

159.

POLEMOS

Polemos (Greek "war") is conflict in the sense of differentiating activity – an ongoing, unfolding dynamic in a specific situation as historically given. Heidegger employs the word *polemos* to articulate a new vocabulary to express the relationship between Dasein and being in the hermeneutical construal of a world; *polemos*, as conflictual, situated, and temporal, is intended to replace the Platonic *idea*, as static, transcendent, and eternal, as what gives meaning to both entities and the world in which entities make sense. Heidegger draws the word *polemos* from the work of the pre-Socratic thinker Heraclitus, translating it variously as *Kampf* (battle, struggle), *Streit* (strife), and *Auseinandersetzung* (confrontation, disputation), which becomes his preferred rendering. He focuses particularly on Fragment 53 of Heraclitus, which in a conventional translation might run as follows: "War [*polemos*] is the father of all things and the king of all things, and it reveals some as gods, others as human beings; it makes some slaves, others free." The fragment challenges the customary pre-eminence of Zeus as father and king of all things, replacing the god with a principle, *polemos* (war), that is all-encompassing, from the cosmos, to gods and mortals, to the social reality of human beings.

Heidegger's first known mention of the fragment comes in a 1933 letter to the political theorist Carl Schmitt, thanking Schmitt for sending a copy of his newly revised edition of *The Concept of the Political*: "Your quote from Heraclitus particularly pleased me in that you did not forget the *basileus*, which gives the fragment its full meaning, if one interprets it completely. I have had such an interpretation with respect to the concept of truth set down for years – the *edeixe* and the *epoiêse* that appear in Fragment 53. But now I myself stand in the midst of the *polemos* and all literary projects must give way" (Heidegger 1987, 132). No earlier discussion has yet come to light, but the date is significant biographically and philosophically. In 1933, Heidegger and Schmitt had publicly joined the Nazi party, and Heidegger became the Rector of Freiburg University, a role to which he refers as his *polemos* with the historical and political situation. That Heidegger emphasizes the role of the *basileus*, the king, is no accident in this context: at issue is the role of political rule, both Hitler's as supreme leader (*Führer*), and local leaders, such as Heidegger himself, at the helm of his university.

In this period, primarily in lecture courses of the early to mid-1930s, Heidegger sought a new philosophical vocabulary to convey the revolution in thinking that he had announced in *Being and Time* and that would initiate a new inception to Western history in confrontation with the nihilistic collapse of the first inception, which he locates in Plato's doctrine of ideas, which had eclipsed the thinking of Heraclitus and other earlier Greek philosophers. For Heidegger, Plato's theory of the forms, or ideas, posits a source of the meaning of "all things" that is timeless, universal, and ontic (GA36/37:165–66). In *polemos*, Heidegger found a word that suggests the meaning of Dasein's world as temporal, particular, and ontological, all as an expression of the historicity of being.

Heidegger's earliest and most sustained known treatment of Fragment 53 is in his winter semester lectures of 1933–34, published as *Being and Truth* (GA36/37:89–118). Here, he

translates *polemos* as "struggle" (*Kampf*) and argues that this struggle is the essence of being, and as such, the essence of TRUTH. Struggle is both progenitor (*patêr*, father) and ruler (*basileus*, king): it both gives rise to entities and sustains them in a meaningful world for Dasein. The *edeixe* and the *epoiêse* of the fragment indicate that the struggle does this by the *setting-out* into truth and *letting-go-forth* of entities into truth as ALÊTHEIA, UNCONCEALMENT. For Heidegger, the *poein* of the *epoiêse* is not making or creating ex nihilo, but rather "the letting-go-forth in which the forth means forth out of the previous absence and concealment, into *the state of being set forth*, so the entities stand in openness, that is, 'are'" (GA36/37:117). This is the truth of historical unconcealment of entities in a meaningful world for Dasein, rather than truth as the correctness of assertions about an objective world – the conception of truth that has come to dominate the Western tradition since Plato (GA36/37:118–24).

For this reason, Heidegger says, in *Introduction to Metaphysics*, that "*polemos* and *logos* are the same" (GA40:66/65; also GA97:39): the collectedness of meaning into an intelligible world, as *logos*, must happen in the differentiation of struggle, as *polemos*, that separates and distinguishes entities from one another, and this collected differentiation is a temporal, ongoing one where meanings emerge from concealment into presence and may again subside: "where struggle ceases, entities indeed do not disappear, but world turns away" (GA40:67/65). This also explains Heidegger's rendering of *polemos* as "confrontation" (*Auseinandersetzung*), which becomes his preferred translation and which he often hyphenates as *Aus-einander-setzung*, a setting-forth-and-apart-from-one-another, to emphasize the differentiation of *polemos* into a meaningful, gathered, world.

This differentiating activity of *polemos* leads Heidegger into disturbing political views. In late 1933, he says that *polemos* "does not mean the outward occurrence of war and the celebration of what is 'military,' but rather what is decisive: standing against the enemy." He describes this "enemy" as having "attached itself to the innermost roots of the Dasein of a PEOPLE" and says that the *polemos* against it must prepare an "attack looking far ahead with the goal of total annihilation" (GA36/37:90–91). After the war, in an attempt to justify himself, Heidegger wrote that *polemos* "does not mean war" but rather "strife" (*Streit*) and therefore he never intended to promote "war and combat as the highest principle of all being" (Heidegger 1983, 28–29). While his tone does soften after 1935, and he focuses more on *polemos* as *Aus-einander-setzung* and the "strife between EARTH and world" which develops into his later discussions of the FOURFOLD of earth and sky, mortals and immortals, the "total annihilation" passage indicates that he also did not separate *polemos* from the more mundane features of conflict and that he was willing to contemplate extreme measures against the "enemy" of the German people, measures that found their realization in the Final Solution, even if he did not contribute to its specific conception and implementation.

Gregory Fried

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA9:424–25/320–21; GA16:156/Heidegger 1987; GA16:283–84; GA16:379–380/Neske and Kettering 1990; GA36/37:90–125; GA39:125–27; GA40:66–67/65–66, 121–22/120–21, 140/139–40, 148–49/148–49, 153/153, 175–76/177–78; GA54 26; GA65:265; GA67:36, 77; GA76:21–24, 37–38; GA86:115, 135, 177; GA94:217, 299; GA95:188, 402–03; GA96:142, 171; GA97:39

Strife (*Streit*) GA5:35–36, 42, 45, 48–53, 56–58, 61, 64 ; GA40:66, 121, 200; GA54:26–28, 106–07;
GA65:7, 29–31, 96, 249, 264–65, 277–80, 321–22, 388–92, 399–400, 470–71, 479, 482–86, 497,
510; GA66:15, 84, 275, 343; GA73.1:50, 92, 129, 211–12, 243, 291, 296–97, 382; GA93:333, 336
Struggle (*Kampf*) SZ 384, 385; GA4:160; GA5:29, 92–94, 256–57; GA11:134; GA12:201; GA13:20,
25–26, 32; GA16:379–80; GA17:122; GA19:51–52, 273–74, 280–81, 303–04, 440; GA33:24; GA36/
37:8–9, 89–95, 117–24, 127–28, 147, 166, 185, 233, 262–64, 288; GA38:8–9, 70–71; GA39:22–23,
125–27, 289, 292–93; GA40:66–67, 113–15, 130, 140, 153, 176–77, 201; GA42:281; GA65:41, 98,
244, 309, 482; GA66:15, 84; GA95:11–12, 287, 375; GA96:42, 98–99, 140–43, 224, 227, 172
War (*Krieg*) GA7:91–92, 95, 109; GA9:424; GA11:134; GA16:379; GA40:66; GA54:27; GA 66:15;
GA95:235; GA96:29, 140–42, 145–46, 224–25

FURTHER READING

Derrida 1993, Elden 2006, chap. 2, Fried 2000, Jollivet 2003, Sörensen and Münch 2013, Trawny 2007,
Žižek 2009

160.
POSSIBILITY (*MÖGLICHKEIT*)

A possibility is "a possible way of being," a field of meaningfully interconnected states of objects or events that might be actualized or realized (but need not be so actualized). To be a Dasein is unavoidably to be and to understand oneself in terms of possibilities. Possibility is a limit concept rather than logical possibility: the ontological structure of Dasein is finitude, defined by death, the impossibility of possibility or the possibility of utter impossibility. Nevertheless, ultimately possibility must be understood as being, that which grants itself and holds sway in the ways of being of Dasein.

Heidegger does not reserve the term "possibility" for Dasein. For example, he speaks of "a *possible* interconnection of the available" (*einer* Möglichkeit *des Zusammenhangs von Zuhandenem*, SZ 144), as well as the conditions of the possibility of the being of nature (SZ 145). Nor is *Möglichkeit* the only term he uses that can be translated "possibility." He also speaks, for example, of the *Seinkönnen* or ability-to-be of Dasein, Dasein's possibility (translated by Macquarrie and Robinson as "Dasein's potentiality-for-Being," SZ 143). Nevertheless the primary importance of the term "possibility" (*Möglichkeit*) lies in the part it plays in the analytic of Dasein.

Perhaps the most important locus for understanding what Heidegger means by possibility is found in §31 of *Being and Time*, "Being-there as Understanding." In ordinary parlance, we can say that we understand something and mean that we are able to do that thing: "I understand how to make a pie." Heidegger uses the term "understanding" in that way. But that which we are able to do "is not a 'what,' but being as existing." "Dasein is its 'there'" (SZ 143), and "its being-there is being-in" (SZ 143).

Consider a tournament chess player. It isn't that such a person knows a "what," such as the rules for playing chess. Knowing the rules is not sufficient to make one a chess player. Rather the person *is* a chess player. She is competent to act as a chess player acts. Of course that includes playing chess according to the rules, but it might also include behaviors ordinarily thought of as extraneous to playing a game of chess. Perhaps she also shows an interest in international chess rankings or in wearing clothing typical of those with whom she plays chess. Perhaps certain turns of phrase are common to chess players. More than an understanding that something is the case, she has the know-how appropriate to being a chess player. She understands because she is competent to do a range of things afforded her by her world.

To understand possibility fully, however, we must distinguish between possibility as such and whatever particular things are possible for Dasein at some moment. In our concernful behavior, "there is a tendency to *annihilate the possibility* of the possible by making it available to us," but that annihilation is never anything more than relative because even something that has been actualized remains possible since "it is characterized by an 'in-order-to' [*Um-zu*]" (SZ 261). The ontological structure of Dasein is possibility (*Möglichsein*), and only because of that can it have the factical ability to be or do this or that particular thing (*Seinkönnen*).

Whatever possibilities Dasein has must be limited or it would not have a WORLD at all; an infinite being would be worldless. We see that limitation in the being-there of Dasein, where we see that what we take to be limitation is, in fact, the possibility of acting at all. The being of the THERE of Dasein – its finitude – occurs in Dasein knowing its ability-to-be, which Heidegger calls understanding (SZ 144). This means that Dasein is not only located spatially and temporally, but also in terms of those actions called for and appropriate to the world in which Dasein finds itself, all of which are constituted by such things as HISTORY and social relations, and all of which are revealed in some particular way in Dasein's MOOD. Within that "there," Dasein grasps what the situation affords, its own possibilities for action. It is important to note that though most, if not all, of Heidegger's examples of possibility in *Being and Time* are examples of how Dasein can manipulate an object, such as the famous hammer of §18, he does not have in mind merely how one might manipulate objects. He says explicitly that Dasein's possibilities for action include "solicitude for others and . . . concern with the 'world'" (SZ 143).

All of this means that possibility cannot be thought of simply as logical possibility, nor is it to be understood merely via the contingency of the OCCURRENT (these actions lie before me as things I can choose amongst to act out). Neither is consciousness of possibility a necessity. Indeed, it would be impossible for an individual to be conscious of all of her possibilities. Understanding is not the same as CONSCIOUSNESS. Instead, BEING-IN-THE-WORLD is disclosed in the FOR-THE-SAKE-OF-WHICH, and that disclosure is understanding (SZ 143): the student finds herself in the world of the classroom and that world is disclosed by the way she acts within the world as a student. "Dasein always understands itself . . . in terms of a possibility of itself" (SZ 12), and "Its being-possible is transparent to itself in different possible ways and degrees" (SZ 144). As an EXISTENTIAL, possibility is "the most primordial and ultimate positive way in which Dasein is characterized ontologically" (SZ 44).

After *Being and Time*, we see Heidegger continuing to think possibility in "Letter on 'Humanism.'" In particular he considers what it means to say that the ontological structure of Dasein is possibility (*Möglichsein*). In this letter to Jean Beaufret, Heidegger connects possibility (*Möglichkeit*) with will or preference (*Mögen*) and power or capacity (*Vermögen*, GA9:315–17/241–42). At first glance that is obvious; it may even seem tautological. But, non-obviously, Heidegger's claim is that to prefer or favor something or some person (i.e., to will) is to give the object of one's preference "their ESSENCE as a gift." This seems strange until we recognize that in the letter the giver is being rather than another person: being gives Dasein its essence: it enables (*Vermögen*) the will or preferences (*Mögen*) of Dasein by giving it possibility (*Möglichkeit*).

THINKING – the thinking of being (thinking from out of being and thinking that listens to being), as opposed to mere calculation – comes to an end when it slips out of its element, out of "the enabling" (*das Vermögen*, GA9:315–16/241), out of what makes it possible. Heidegger recognizes that, when thought in terms of logic and metaphysics, the possible and possibility are understood in terms of actuality and potentiality. In contrast he understands possibility as being itself: "when I speak of the 'quiet power of the possible' I do not mean the *possible* of a merely represented *possibilitas*, nor *potentia* as the *essentia* of an *actus* of *existentia*; rather I mean being itself" (GA9:317/242). Possibility is that in which thinking must remain.

Any thinking of what it means to be human, therefore, is a thinking of being. In *What is Called Thinking?* Heidegger says, "Every philosophical – that is, thoughtful – doctrine of the essence of the human is *in itself alone* a doctrine of the being of entities. Every doctrine of being is *in itself*

alone a doctrine of the essence of the human" (GA8:73/79). Or as he says similarly: "the essence of the human being consists in its being more than merely human … more originally and therefore more essentially in terms of its essence" (GA9:342/260). The essence of the human is the possibility granted it by being to be the shepherd of being, to be that being through which the revelation of being is and continues to be possible *as* possibility.

Thus *Contributions to Philosophy* (GA65) sums up possibility this way:

> The possible – and even the possible pure and simple – opens out only in the attempt [*Versuch*]. . . . As putting-itself-beyond-itself, the will *stands* in a being-beyond-itself [*Übersichhinaussein*]. . . . [Be-ing] occurs as bold venture [*Wagnis*]. And only in a bold venture does man reach into the domain of de-cision [*Ent-scheidung*]. And only in the bold venture is he capable of deliberating [*wägen*].
>
> Being is and therefore does not become a being; this is expressed most sharply thus: BEYNG is possibility [*das Seyn ist Möglichkeit*] (GA65:475)

What Heidegger says about possibility in *Being and Time* remains important, namely that his analysis of the possible shows that concernful human action, in comporting itself toward the possible, does not consider possibility by starting from possibility as such, but instead, by attending to that for which something is possible (SZ 261).

James E. Faulconer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ §31; GA9:315–17/241–42

FURTHER READING

Ciocan 2011

POTENTIALITY-FOR-BEING (*SEINKÖNNEN*). SEE ABILITY-TO-BE.

161.
POWER (*MACHT*)

Power in the ordinary sense is the ability to overcome limits on one's capacity to act. On Heidegger's ontological interpretation of power, power is an essential aspect of the experience of entities in the technological age (see Technology). The drive for power is the imperative that shapes the contemporary, technological world, as a result of which entities show up as incapable of making demands on us or constraining the ways in which they are used (see GA7:91/EP 104). The drive for power, as a structural feature of the background against which entities appear, involves two complementary aspects:

1. Power drives constantly toward the "overpowering of each attained level of power" (GA69: 54).
2. Power involves "the exclusion of every outside that is not itself"; it "alone determin[es] the essence of beings" (GA69:54).

As Heidegger explains elsewhere, "the commanding character of power" includes both "its own overpowering of itself" as well as "the commanding subjugation of all that must find itself within the sphere of things at its disposal" (GA66:18), a subjugation that "leads finally to the ultimate phase of the desolation of the subdued, boundless scope of power" (GA66:20).

The first aspect of power – the "overpowering of each attained level of power" – is power as concerned with the constant "preservation and enhancement of human constructs of domination" (GA48:113, quoting Nietzsche; see also GA66:17–18; GA90:229). That means that power always drives toward securing its ability to maintain itself while also surmounting any limits that might restrict the options open to it (see GA66:20). This points us to the second aspect of power – its concern with freeing itself from the mechanisms that, in the past, were used to restrain the use of force. Appeals to ethics, morality, law, and justice, for instance, no longer succeed in circumscribing the expansion of power: "where power becomes historical as the essence of being, all morality and legality are banished, and indeed unconditionally. Power is neither moral nor immoral, it unfolds its power outside of morality, law, and custom" (GA69:66). Eventually, Heidegger predicts, power will "unconditionally shatter" every value or ideal which might be used to restrain power. In the "pure empowering of power," even "goals become superfluous" (GA66:22) – power as a means for achieving particular ends becomes an end in itself:

> The essence of power does not tolerate an area beyond power. Therefore, there is no district that as the Other to power could be posited as its "goal." Power does not need goals and therefore it is not aimless – it is empowerment of its essence – and nothing more. (GA90:229; see also GA50:33)

In its consummate form, then, power will no longer answer to any imperative other than that of "the unceasing exceeding of each attained level of power" (GA69:56):

the agent of a power is "legitimated" through the fact that he administers power. With what right does he administer power? In virtue of power itself, which does not recognize anything outside of itself, and posits by itself what law and order is. *Power determines in itself the space of right (Rechtsraum)*. (GA90:173, emphasis in the original)

Power in its contemporary form is thus to be understood as the will to will – the drive to an unconditioned and unconstrained and thus ultimately aimless capacity to will as one sees fit (see GA7:87/EP 101).

Heidegger's account of power is heavily indebted to his interpretation of Nietzsche's doctrine of the will to power. According to Heidegger, Nietzsche was the thinker who first and most clearly grasped the emergence in our age of a new form of power. On Heidegger's reading, "the doctrine of the 'Will to Power'" is to be understood as "the empowering of power to its constant overpowering" (GA66:193). The essence of this new form of power "does not only lie in . . . the capacity for domination that has at its disposal the means of all forces" (GA69:158). The old-fashioned view of power (according to which power means having the force at one's disposal to exert dominion within a sphere) fails to grasp what is truly essential about power in our age. Now it is power (as the constant overcoming of limitations or constraints) that has *us* in its power: "power . . . cannot be 'grasped' like an occurrent thing that is brought under control; rather one must only and can only *be possessed by it* – be carried by it, that means stand in its bondage" (GA90:181).

Heidegger sees the wars and revolutions and power struggles of the early twentieth century as "traces" or indications of the way power in this ontological sense is altering what entities are, with a corresponding change in the character of human existence (see GA7:88/EP 101). In particular, he sees in the rise of power politics, the normalization of war, race-thinking, and communism, indications that the background texture of our world is changing in fundamental and distressing ways. In a world organized by an imperative to exclude every consideration other than the "constant overpowering of each attained level of power," we will no longer experience ourselves, our purpose in life, and the entities around us in terms of the "standards or goals or motivations belonging to humankind hitherto" (GA69:23). In its consummate form – Heidegger calls it "MACHINATION"– power will so thoroughly pervade the world that everything will show up as infinitely "malleable" or "makeable" (see GA66:17; GA69:41). In a world decisively ordered in accordance with machination, we will be able to reconfigure entities in any way that we want, and order them in such a way as to maximize our options for use: "everything becomes ever more new and ever more rapidly new" (GA69:130).

Power is thus the inner nature of TECHNOLOGY, which "unlocks" and "exposes" and "switches about ever anew" all entities, reducing them to resources (GA7:16/QCT 15). "Power, concealed in modern technology, determines the relation of human beings to that which exists. It rules the whole earth" (GA16:523/DT 50).

Heidegger predicts that, with the "inexorable retraction of every possibility of determining power by way of something that it itself is not" (GA69:157), we will experience as intolerable any restrictions on our ability to constantly expand, develop, experiment with life, and overcome old restraints. Then the emerging kind of power will enter its consummate form. Heidegger's vision of the end state of power anticipates in intriguing ways Foucault's much later account of the rise of biopower. As old, "outside" aims or goals of existence lose their grip on us, Heidegger argues that

the human being today . . . is entering that cluelessness that vacillates in all directions and that now allows him only to be on the lookout for "goals" that are supposed to exceed what has gone before. . . . [B]eyond the cultivation of competence and the pleasurable aspect of bodily life there remains nothing more than the unconditional expansion of this "goal" to the entire mass of humans who find pleasure and health, are industrialized and technicized and make culture, in a process that continually registers the intensification of these life interests anew. (GA69:175)

The consummate form of power, then, will be a condition in which the WORLD is secured as a repository of multitudinous available possible ways to pursue a flourishing life, none of which is any higher or more sacred than another.

But Germany and the world in the 1930s, when Heidegger was writing on power, was not yet in a consummate stage of power. In the then-prevailing initial phase of the "overpowering" of power, Heidegger explains, things will appear quite different. Initially, power will resort to violence to "transpose beings into the domain of power" (GA69:64). That is, as long as people and entities are guided by some "outside" imperative, it will take compulsion to break them down and reorient them, fitting them into the power domain that aims only at multiplying options and maximizing flexibility. Of course, if people are still committed to such external sources of mattering, power will need a pretext to justify the violent reorganization of the world. That pretext is served by political factions or "interests" who "parade various 'ideals' before them in each case, ideals whose desirability spurs on the need for power" (GA69:159). Heidegger believes that every appeal to "social justice," the "progress of culture," "the saving of western 'culture,'" the "new 'world order,'" or any "political system" (GA69:65) is in fact a means exploited by power to undermine our will to resist the emerging reorganization of the world. "Power needs the public," Heidegger muses, "but with the intent of confusing it through and through, and of undermining the possibility of forming an opinion. The result of this confusion is complete indifference toward everything" (GA69:71).

Initially, Heidegger speculates, power will be concentrated and used by individual dictators and political factions. But ultimately, "power tolerates no possessors" (GA69:165) and thus it will eventually "undermine dictatorship, because the latter brings with it a petrification at one level of power and excludes itself from the open realm of the unconditional" (GA69:162). One cannot emphasize clearly enough that Heidegger in no way endorses or approves of either the ultimate "empowering of power" or the initial rise of machination, characterized as it is by wars, the totalitarian regimes, and "struggles for world power." He condemns unequivocally the age of empowering power as an "annihilation," a "devastation," a "laying 'waste'" that amounts to an "undermining of every possibility of any decision and of all domains of decisions" (GA69:43). After all, it is in the possibility of genuine decision, rather than merely choosing from the options that the world of machination provides, that Heidegger finds our highest human "dignity." "Dignity remains so decisively alien to power," Heidegger insists, "that it may not even be posited as its opposite" (GA69:65).

One finds in his discussions of power some of Heidegger's most direct condemnations of German nationalism and National Socialism[1] – movements that he had embraced in the early 1930s, but now regards as tools or means exploited by power to break down meaningful ideals and

---

[1] One can also find a number of passages in the notorious BLACK NOTEBOOKS where he confesses to having misjudged the true significance of National Socialism. See, for example, GA95:408.

commitments that would lead to resistance to consummate machination. "Nationalism of the people and socialism of the people," Heidegger argues, is merely "a claim to power … asserted for the sake of power itself" (GA69:40). Heidegger mocks the Hitlerian ideology of struggle, *Kampf*, as "power-technological violent suppression, for the sake of power, in which process 'goals' merely play the role of means for power" (GA69:56). He sees through the cynicism of Nazi projects of racial breeding and racial hygiene, explaining that the emphasis on "racial hygiene is a measure in keeping with power. It can therefore be deployed at one moment and put on hold the next. . . . It is by no means an 'ideal' in itself" (GA69:60). The glorification of the PEOPLE (*das Volk*), and the "splendor and showmanship" of Nazi pageantry likewise are regarded as tools to confuse, distract, and draw people away from any commitments that would impair the constant overcoming of power:

> The point is simply a form of social order that grants unconditional rule. This permeating of the people by power, who are publically declared to be the sole bearers of the will, is a preemptive and unconditional disempowering. It belongs to it that it act precisely without splendor, without the many forms of ostentation, without becoming entangled in mere institutions on account of the greatest possible wretchedness. To the possession of power and its display there belong splendor and din; to the essence of power and its own securing there belongs the greatest wretchedness. This wretchedness requires an extensive superficiality of thought. It is best served by thoughtlessness. (GA69:70)

"The most honest struggle to save freedom and ethical life," Heidegger concludes as he assesses the contemporary conditions in Nazi-era Germany, "serves only to maintain and increase a possession of power whose powerfulness will not tolerate being questioned, because the preeminence of power as the being of beings has already seized power over morality and its defense as an essential means of power" (GA69:156). Power itself uses "the saving of national traditions [*Volkstümer*] and the securing of one's 'eternal' racial survival as supreme goals" (GA69:156). The "positing of these same goals (the securing of 'morality,' the saving of '*völkisch* substance') is nevertheless always something belated that remains unknowingly and unintentionally placed into the service of the empowering of power" (GA69:156). A consistent theme running through *The History of Beyng*, in other words, is that the goals of the Nazi regime serve ultimately to demoralize the German people, confuse them and make them indifferent, thereby weaning them from any commitments that would stifle the endless process of over-powering power.

Sadly, it would be a mistake to read such critical comments directed at the Nazi regime as a sign that Heidegger had shaken free of his anti-Semitic views or his hostility to Western liberal democracy. For starters, Heidegger never seriously entertains the possibility that traditional moralities or legal structures could withstand the onslaught of the emerging age of consummate power. "One can be filled with moral indignation," Heidegger muses, "yet one must know that this is not a response that is commensurate with power. Nor can a retreat to the moral ever fathom the ground of this essence of truth … or prepare an overcoming. With the aid of morality, one can only evade, and that means, exclude oneself from history, which proceeds via the unleashing of the essence of power into machination" (GA69:68). The complete over-powering of all "outside" sources of meaning, Heidegger claims, is something that cannot be stopped but must be gone through.

Heidegger goes on to treat Western "parliamentary" democracies as on a par with the totalitarian regimes in Germany and Russia. The "reciprocal judging and condemning of fundamental political positions," Heidegger argues, "also belongs to the form of their implementation of power. Yet it also prevents essential insight into the *metaphysical* sameness … of these modern configurations of the political implementation of power" (GA69:160–61). British parliamentary democracy, in other words, is metaphysically the same as the Nazi or Soviet regimes because each of them, in their own way, is exploiting their people's adherence to "values" to justify the expansion of power. Any use of power, Heidegger suggests, can be rationalized when "one's own illusory essence becom[es] inflated into the role of savior of morality" (GA69:177). Heidegger thus, quite cynically, criticizes the "immense deception" perpetrated by "the modern English state" which, "in the semblance of morality and the education of peoples makes all implementation of power harmless and self-evident" (GA69:176). His considered view seems to be that appeals to, on the one hand, democracy, morality, legality, and human rights and, on the other hand, racial hygiene or nationalism are merely "reciprocally opposing sides [of] the walls of pretext behind which pure power exerts itself" (GA69:132).

Worst of all, rather than seeing the Jewish people as victims of the initial, violent phase of empowering, Heidegger suggests that "one would have to ask what are the grounds that peculiarly predetermine the Jewish community for planetary criminality" (GA69:66). By "planetary criminality," he refers to the process of the annihilation of meaningful differences that accompanies power's destruction of all outside orders. He thus blames the most visible victims of power for the condition of moral devastation that leads to their genocide.

Mark A. Wrathall

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA7:91–92/EP 104–05; GA50:13–14, 33, 48, 53–57, 63; GA66:18–20, 22, 39, 87, 155, 188, 190, 193, 308, 372; GA67:35, 48–49, 116, 159, 164; GA90:52, 139, 172–77, 181, 229–30
Works in which power is a central theme include:
"The Will to Power as Art" (GA43 and GA6.1/N1)
"Nietzsche's Doctrine of the Will to Power as Knowledge" (GA47 and GA6.1/N3)
"The Eternal Recurrence of the Same and the Will to Power" (GA6.2/N3)
"European Nihilism" (GA48 and GA6.2/N4)
The History of Beyng (GA69)

PRE-POSSESSION (*VORHABE*). SEE FORE-STRUCTURE.

PRECONCEPTION (*VORGRIFF*). SEE FORE-STRUCTURE.

PREDICAMENT (*NOT*). SEE EMERGENCY.

PREHENSION (*VORSTELLUNG*). SEE REPRESENTATION.

PREOCCUPATION (*UMGANG*). SEE COPING.

PRESENCE (*VORHANDENHEIT, VORHANDENSEIN*). SEE OCCURRENTNESS.

PRESENCE-AT-HAND (*VORHANDENHEIT*). SEE OCCURRENTNESS.

162.
PRESENCING (*ANWESEN*)

"Presencing" names the temporal and dynamic character of being itself (*Sein selbst*), as well as our distinctive engagement and CORRESPONDENCE with being as manifestation and emergence (GA78:56–63). Being "is" or "essences" by presencing, as entities "come-to-presence." "Presencing" and related terms are central to Heidegger's lifelong meditation on being, beingness, and entities.

Heidegger lamented that the earliest vibrant Greek experience of what we encounter had been deadened by the philosophical vocabulary of "being." To recover the originary Greek experience of the astonishing EMERGENCE of all entities, he employed the language of things "presencing" or "coming-to-presence," that is, *anwesen* or *das Anwesen*. He chose this word to translate Aristotle's notion of *ousia*, which had served as a cornerstone of the thinking of being as timeless "substance" and "essence" in the subsequent history of Western metaphysics (GA9:260/199; see HISTORY OF BEING).

Yet Heidegger noted that in Aristotle's own time period, this word *ousia* also referred more simply to estate, property, or possessions that are "present." This more immediate and experiential sense of *ousia*, he observed, is retrievable with the German word *das Anwesen*, which also has the sense of present estate or property. His fundamental point, though, was that Aristotle's "philosophical" term *ousia* still retained something of the Greek experience of things emerging and appearing and lying before us, that is, of things rising up into "presence," lingering in "presence," and then moving out of "presence." The human experience of the temporal emerging and unfolding of all entities was still in the background of Aristotle's understanding of *ousia*, but it was entirely eclipsed and lost in the subsequent metaphysical tradition's mere academic codification of *ousia* as atemporal "substance" and "essence." Thus, for Heidegger, the language of "coming-to-presence," *das Anwesen*, brought into view once more the temporal and dynamic character of being.

Consequently, over the course of his thinking, Heidegger employed "presencing" understood in the *verbal* sense as another name for being itself. He often reserved the word "presence" (*Anwesenheit*) to refer to the sheer, perduring presence or presentness of what-comes-to-presence, which he identified with the BEINGNESS (*Seiendheit*) of entities (*das Seiende*), which was the principal concern of the metaphysical tradition of thinking in the form of *eidos*, *idea*, *morphē*, *essentia*, *quidditas*, *actus purus*, *actualitas*. He also used the word "the what-is-present" (*das Anwesende*) to name any particular entity. This general pattern of usage can be found throughout his later writings, but two of the most important texts are "Anaximander's Saying" (1946, GA5) and *What Is Called Thinking?* (1951–52, GA8).

Although this broad outline highlights his basic usage of these terms, a few additional clarifying comments are needed. His intention was always to draw out the verbal sense of *das Anwesen*, but he was aware that the word could also be understood in the nominal sense as well. In the nominal sense, *das Anwesen* is the equivalent of *die Anwesenheit*, that is, the abiding, perduring, "constant" "presence" of what-is-present, which became the principal concern of the

metaphysical tradition of thinking. When *das Anwesen* is used principally in this nominal sense, Heidegger contrasts it with the expression "letting presence" (*das Anwesenlassen*) in order to highlight and emphasize that his proper concern is with the temporal and dynamic "letting" – that is, *coming-to*-presence – that characterizes being itself (GA15:364/FS 59). Along these lines, in some of his later reflections, he preferred the infinitive form, *anwesen*, or the infinitive form intensified, *anwesen selbst*, in order to more clearly and vividly convey the temporal character of being itself as the manifesting-unfolding way (GA15:403–07). His aim was always to find the language that could keep the temporal, dynamic dimension fully in view, "to keep things moving," we might say.

Yet, perhaps not surprisingly, Heidegger did not always use the word "presence" (*die Anwesenheit*) as a simple stand-in for stable and constant "presence," which was the chief concern of metaphysical thinking. On occasion, he would remind us that the Greeks experienced "presence" in a dynamic way, and although the Greek philosophers Plato and Aristotle became fascinated and captured by the perduring "presence" of things (*eidos*, *idea*, *morphē*, *ousia*), still, in the background of their thinking there remained the originary Greek experience of all things coming-to-presence. So, for example, in speaking of presence in 1965, he noted:

> What we call, ambiguously and confusedly enough, "entities," the Greek philosophers experienced as what-is-present [*das Anwesende*] because being was granted to them as presence [*Anwesenheit*]. And in this [presence], what was thought together was the passage from presencing to absencing, from arriving to departing, from emerging to passing away, that is, movement. (GA16:624/QDMT 216)

In the 1930s Heidegger employed the word "essencing" (*die Wesung*) in order to draw out the verbal sense of "essence" (*das Wesen*), which in traditional metaphysical thinking had come to refer to the "timeless" essence of things. He wanted to make clear that his concern was with the temporal "essencing of being" (*die Wesung des Seins*) and not with any kind of static "essence of being." The word "essencing," therefore, brought to light being as temporal unfolding. In *Contributions to Philosophy (of the Event)* (1936–38), he stated that essencing characterizes being (BEYNG) first and foremost: "essencing does not belong to all entities, but fundamentally only to being and what belongs to being itself: TRUTH" (GA65:289). In other words, the "essencing" of being is also the "truthing" of being as the manifesting-emerging-unfolding way.

In the 1930s Heidegger also used the word "presencing" (*die Anwesung*) in the same way as "essencing" (*Wesung*), at least in some instances. For example, in his important commentary "*On the Essence and Concept of Phusis in Aristotle's Physics B, 1*" (composed in 1939), he featured the term presencing in a prominent way to characterize the movement of *phusis*. In this text, presencing refers more specifically to the movement *into* presence, while the "absencing" dimension of manifestation is named with the word *Abwesung* – moving *out* of presence. Nevertheless, he further observed that, properly understood, "absencing" is a "presencing" of sorts, and thus, in his words, "absencing is not simply absentness; rather, it is a *presencing*, namely, that kind in which the *absencing* (but not the absent thing) is present" (GA9:296–97/226–27; italics in original). Considered in this way, then, the term presencing, like essencing, names the *fulness* of the manifesting-emerging-unfolding process that always includes the dimension of withholding and reserve. Even so, in his major later writings on this matter, already noted, the term presencing (*Anwesung*) faded from view in favor of the terms *das Anwesen*, *anwesen*, and *anwesen selbst*.

"Being, this word now spoken in a considered manner, [is] *einai* as *Anwesen*," so stated Heidegger in "Anaximander's Saying" (GA5:349/263). Furthermore, as late as 1973, in a statement on Parmenides that he had prepared for the final seminar session in Zähringen, he observed that what is always at stake for thinking is to be able to "glimpse" "what-is-present [from out of] presencing itself [*anwesend*: *anwesen selbst*]" (GA15:406–07) – that is, to glimpse entities as they emerge from out of being itself.

Richard Capobianco

FURTHER READING

Capobianco 2010, Richardson 1963

PRESENT (*DA*). SEE THERE.

PRESENT (OUT THERE) (*VORHANDEN*). SEE OCCURRENTNESS.

PRESENCE-AT-HAND (*VORHANDEN*). SEE OCCURRENTNESS.

PRESENTATION (*VORSTELLUNG*). SEE REPRESENTATION.

163.
PREVAILING (*WALTEN*)

REVAILING IS THE self-moving power bestowed by being onto entities. Through the power of this prevailing, entities are able to come to be as themselves. As the force which takes hold between being and entities, prevailing thus serves as a significant element in Heidegger's later conception of ontological DIFFERENCE. While difference drives being and entities apart, Heidegger designates prevailing as the force that holds them together. Prevailing is not only a central term for Heidegger's later ontology, emerging directly out of his engagement with Aristotelian metaphysics after *Being and Time*, but it also serves to link his ontology to philosophy of LANGUAGE, critique of TECHNOLOGY, and political philosophy.

Prevailing translates the German verb *walten*, which Heidegger's translators also often render as "to sway," "to reign," and "to govern." Heidegger uses prevailing both as a noun (*Walten*) in its substantivized infinitive form and as a verb (*walten*), and often combines it with prefixes to create cognate terms such as "to prevail through" (*durchwalten*), "prevail over" (*obwalten*), "prevail around" (*umwalten*), "administrate" (*verwalten*), and "govern over" (*vorwalten*). He also commonly employs the active participial form *das Waltende*, "that which prevails." In ordinary German *Walten* and its cognates are not only associated with various forms of political force and POWER, but can also refer to gentler forms of power such as the mood that takes hold over a room, a lover's power of attraction, or the reign of a god. Heidegger often exploits this vast range of meanings, as well as the proximity of *Walten* to *Gewalt*, the common word for political force and violence. Nonetheless, while Heidegger will occasionally use the term in its more literal sense in discussions of politics and ethics, in its ontological usage prevailing does not designate a power over which humans can prevail. Instead, prevailing is a power that takes hold over and through humans, but also entities as a whole.

Heidegger first introduces prevailing in his 1929 inaugural lecture "What is Metaphysics?" in the context of a discussion of ANXIETY. He explains the term in more detail in *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*, his lecture course begun the same year, in the context of an explication of Aristotle's ontology in a section entitled "The Two Meanings of *Phusis*." Though commonly translated as "nature," Heidegger intentionally avoided the Latinate term and instead offers the highly unorthodox and original translation of *phusis* as prevailing. *Phusis* in this unique rendering is not simply a set of things which exist in the world, but it is more precisely the power that allows those things to be things, and even allows the WORLD to be a world (GA38:168/140). Prevailing bears this twofold meaning as both that through which the prevailing prevails and the very force of that prevailing. Heidegger distinguishes these distinct yet closely intertwined meanings of prevailing as (1) "that which prevails in its prevailing" (GA29/30:30), and (2) "prevailing as such as the essence of the inner law of matter" (GA29/30:31). Since this twofold meaning of prevailing remains at the core of all of Heidegger's later uses of the term, grasping both meanings is essential for understanding the significant role that prevailing plays in Heidegger's later thinking.

Heidegger associates the first meaning, that which prevails in its prevailing, with more traditional conceptions of *phusis* as nature. This prevailing denotes the elementary elements

associated with nature "in a narrower sense," as "the vault of the heavens, the stars, the ocean, the earth" (GA29/30:46). Given that this productive natural force embodied in the earth, sky, and other natural entities comes to be of its own accord, it is distinct from the objects created through human skill or craft (*techne*), things which come to be and perish through human intervention. Hence Heidegger states that *phusis* in this sense ought to be understood as a "regional concept" denoting the realm of self-movement that occurs without human intervention (GA29/30:46). Heidegger often refers to prevailing in this sense as the "prevailing of the prevailing" or "the prevailing of that which prevails." Prevailing in this sense is "that which is determined and governed from out of itself" (GA33:46).

As "the essence of the inner law of the matter," prevailing in the second sense does not designate a particular region or domain, but instead refers to the enlivening force which moves matter in a fully Aristotelian sense of motion. *Phusis* conceptualized in this way "does not mean that which prevails itself, but its *prevailing* as such, the essence, the inner law of a matter" (GA29/30:47). This essence or inner law is not a power granted to or bestowed upon humans, but is instead that toward which human beings, guided by the capacity for philosophical listening and attunement, orient themselves within the emerging forth of being.

This power, however, is also not entirely unrelated to more conventional conceptions of human power, for the very fact that human beings can at all have power – be it over themselves, one another, or nature – is enabled by the prevailing. Hence Heidegger writes:

> I emphasize once more that *phusis* as entities as a whole is not meant in the modern, late sense of nature, as the conceptual counterpart to history for instance. Rather it is intended more originally than both of these concepts, in an original meaning which, prior to nature and history, encompasses both, and even in a certain way includes divine beings. (GA29/30:39)

While the role of prevailing in Heidegger's political philosophy will be discussed in more detail below, it is first necessary to show how prevailing is also related to Heidegger's philosophy of language.

In his initial introduction to and most detailed discussion of prevailing, Heidegger summarizes the confluence of the two aforementioned meanings, linking them further to language and understanding: "*Phusis* means this whole prevailing that prevails through man himself, a prevailing that he does not have power over, but which precisely prevails through and around him – him, man, who has always already spoken out about this" (GA29/30:39). Here Heidegger points to the primordial intertwining of human existence with the capacity for language, and many of his later treatments of prevailing are devoted to fleshing out the link between the power of prevailing and the human capacity for language.

The human capacity for language is, by virtue of the prevailing that prevails, enlivened by the power which prevails through human beings. To speak authentically, or, in the language that Heidegger adopts in the 1930s, to speak poetically (*dichtend*), means to speak through and of the prevailing in accordance with its prevailing. Hence in *On the Way to Language* Heidegger defines language as "what prevails in and bears up the relation of human nature to the twofold [*Zwiefalt*]" (GA12:116/OWL 30). In this context, the twofold can be understood as referring to the ontological difference between being and entities. Accordingly for Heidegger, understanding the link between prevailing and language does not require understanding how to speak

about the prevailing, but instead how to grasp the manner in which all language already speaks of and through the prevailing.

In short, being speaks through the prevailing, yet necessarily also diverges from the prevailing:

> It says what emerges from itself (for example, the emergence, the blossoming, of a rose), the unfolding that opens itself up, the coming-into-appearance in such unfolding, and holding itself and persisting in appearance – in short the emerging-abiding prevailing. (GA40:11/15)

Language, if employed authentically and poetically, speaks in accordance with the prevailing by attuning language to the prevailing in the second meaning introduced above. It does so by listening to the things that prevail in the first meaning introduced above. In a reference to the voice of nature which is closely related to his initial introduction of prevailing in his translation of Aristotle's *phusis*, Heidegger discusses the way a stone speaks its prevailing in the context of his elucidation of the poetry of Georg Trakl:

> The old stones are pain itself. . . . The colon after the word "stone" signifies that now *the stone* is speaking. Pain itself has the word. Silent since long ago, it now says to the wanderers who follow the stranger nothing less than its own prevailing and endurance. (GA12:59/OWL 182)

Given that that which prevails speaks in its prevailing as the elemental force of being, the role of the poet is to translate this speech while leaving, to the greatest extent possible, the prevailing untouched, i.e., in its unconcealment.

Heidegger thus describes the role of the poet as follows: "The poet experiences a prevailing, a dignity of the word, vaster and loftier than which nothing can be thought" (GA12:158/OWL 66). Importantly for Heidegger's philosophy of language, the poet renders this experience in poetry through the cultivation of silence, i.e., through the cultivation of the art of withdrawing language at the appropriate moment, for: "by learning that renunciation, the poet undergoes his experience with the world's lofty prevailing" (GA12:159/OWL 67). The unencumbered prevailing of the prevailing relies upon a certain degree of knowing renunciation on the part of the poet in order to leave the prevailing in its unconcealment.

In his 1937/38 lecture course Heidegger draws a similar set of connections between prevailing, the human creative capacity, unconcealment, and renunciation in the context of his critique of technology. There Heidegger describes *techne*, which he translates as technology, as follows:

> For that is what *techne* means: to grasp entities as emerging out of themselves in the way they show themselves . . . to order oneself within entities as a whole through productions and institutions. *Techne* is a mode of proceeding *against phusis*, though not yet in order to prevail over [*überwältigen*] it or exploit it . . . but, on the contrary, to retain the holding prevailing of *phusis* in unconcealedness. (GA45:179)

Technology, understood in its most fundamental sense as the human capacity for creation and bringing forth, operates through a capacity for intervention and a capacity for renunciation, both of which are enabled by prevailing. Technology, however, becomes a destructive force when it sets own goals by attempting to overpower (*überwältigen*) the prevailing, when it becomes "arbitrary" and ceases to be the "occurrence and letting-prevail of the unconcealedness of entities" which is "required by *phusis* itself" (GA45:180).

"Prevailing" does not appear as a term of any particular significance in *Being and Time*, but instead marks a terminological reformulation of Heidegger's conception of the ontological difference in his later work. As Heidegger significantly rethinks his understanding of difference in the 1930s, his rethinking pivots around the key elemental term "prevailing" and its many cognate formulations.

Adam Knowles

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Prevailing as *phusis* GA29/30:38–42, 44–48; GA33:46; GA34:13–14; GA45:177–81; GA40:16–19/ 14–17; GA55:102, 131, 179, 268

Prevailing through GA4:53/76, 67/89; GA6.2:55, 56/N4 32, 33; GA6.2:298/N3 248–49; GA6.2:396, 403/EP 31, 37–38; GA13:144; GA16:543, 742/Neske and Kettering 1990; GA16:744; GA39:182; GA40:142/141–42; GA54:84, 95; GA55:131, 216, 269, 278, 293; GA79:137, 162

Prevailing and language GA9:315/240, 333/253; GA12:116/OWL 30, 59/182, 158/66; GA38:168–70/ 140–41; GA40:136/134–35, 186/188–89, 198/201–02; GA55:44, 138, 148, 241, 265, 317, 340, 345, 381; GA77:201, 225

Prevailing and unconcealment GA7:38/QCT 24; GA9:197–81/150–51, 441/333, 443/335; GA40:66/ 64–65, 179/181; GA54:70–83, 104–16; GA55:179

Prevailing of the world SZ 88; GA5 36/27; GA9:164/126, 167/129; GA29/30:507, 510, 514, 524; GA38:168–70/140–41

Prevailing and the historical Dasein of the people GA38:169/141; GA65:97

Prevailing and anxiety GA9:118/93

Prevailing and technology GA7:38/QCT 34; GA45:179–82; GA77:20

FURTHER READING

Derrida 2011, Fried 2000, Knowles 2013, Ziarek 2014

PRIMORDIAL (*URSPRÜNGLICH*). SEE LEAP.

PRIMORDIAL TEMPORALITY (*TEMPORALITÄT*). SEE TEMPORALITY.

164.
PRINCIPLE (*SATZ*)

A PRINCIPLE IS A grounding assumption in terms of which a thinker or age makes sense of, and so gains access to, entities.

The German term translated as "principle" – *Satz* – has two main meanings in Heidegger's work. The first is best translated as "sentence," although there are passages when "proposition" would be more appropriate, and others where Heidegger aligns *Satz* and assertion (*Aussage*, e.g., GA41:28–29), or where he talks simply of a "propositional assertion" (*Aussagesatz*, GA29/30:439–41). The second is "principle" as, for example, in GA10's title *The Principle of Reason* (*Der Satz vom Grund*). Heidegger himself is obviously aware of this basic ambiguity, and he occasionally highlights it explicitly (GA10:9/7). In this section, the main focus will be on *Satz* as principle; for more details on the other sense of the term, please see the entry on ASSERTION. As I note below, however, there are important links between the two usages.

Heidegger's most extensive discussion of "principles" can be found in GA10 and GA41. GA10 focuses on Leibniz and the rationalist commitment to the principle of sufficient reason, "namely, that nothing happens without a reason" (Leibniz 1989, 321). Heidegger argues that for rationalism this is a "grounding principle" (*Grundsatz*) in two senses: it makes sense of being in terms of reasons or grounds, and it is itself the grounding or fundamental principle that underlies the rationalist worldview (GA10:10/7–8). In GA41, the focus is on the interaction between Kant and modern mathematical science. Heidegger here concentrates on a key portion of the first *Critique*, the "Analytic of Principles" (*Analytik der Grundsätze*), about which he said comparatively little in either GA3 or GA25: located after the Transcendental Deduction, this section details the universal and a priori laws governing entities which supposedly flow from the categories.

In both texts Heidegger presents principles as a prior blueprint (*Grundriß*) through which a thinker or an age understands BEING (GA10:90/61). Such principles are not confined to explicitly philosophical systems such as Leibniz's or Kant's; on the contrary, modern mathematical science works in precisely the same way, defining a framework of measurement and proof in terms of which entities are then approached (GA41:69–70). As Heidegger sees it, many such principles ultimately rest on deeply questionable assumptions: for example, he argues that the idea of a "THING" (*Ding*), supposedly central to post-Cartesian philosophy, is derived from an attempt to use propositional form as a guide to ONTOLOGY (GA41:80–83). In short, *Satz* qua sentence has served as the "guiding thread" (*Leitfaden*) for those principles or *Sätze* underlying modern metaphysics – one sees here the connection between the two meanings I noted above.

Against this backdrop, Heidegger's treatment of principles is defined by two main issues, which I'll take in turn.

First, he is extremely critical of the ontology which the Leibnizian and Kantian grounding principles (*Grundsätze*) generate. For example, in GA10, he aligns the principle of sufficient reason with the presumption that entities answer to or serve the demands of the subject: *ratio* is linked to *rechnen*, glossed as quantitative, instrumental calculation (GA10:149/100), and thus to Heidegger's distinctive vision of the "atomic age" as the site of overweening subjectivity (GA10:151/101). The principle of sufficient reason is thus not a universal ontological law, as the rationalists argued, nor a universal structure of thought, as Kant suggested; instead, it is a specific "deliverance" (*Geschick*) of being, tied to a particular period and to a particular conception of both object and subject – the Greeks, in contrast, had no objects (*Gegenstände*) in the sense in which we now do (GA10:121/82). As this indicates, his treatment of principles is closely bound up with the larger apparatus of the "history of being."

Second, it is unclear how strongly Heidegger construes ideas such as "fundamental" or "blueprint" or the Kantian vocabulary of a prioricity and transcendence which he appropriates and yet historicizes (GA10:129/87). On one reading, defended by Lafont, he regards the various principles as transcendental conditions in the strong sense that they are immune to empirical correction, i.e., that no facts about the entities so understood can contradict or lead to the revision of the initial set of principles (Lafont 2007, 111–12; Lafont 2000, 229). Furthermore, such principles cannot be criticized from any external perspective since the referents, or ontic commitments, of any theory are determined entirely by the principles or ontology which constitute that theory: those who disagree are thus necessarily not talking about the same thing; in Heideggerian terms, they are locked within a different deliverance of being. As Lafont is well aware, this has a number of problematic consequences. For example: "the attempt to conceive the historical changes in our understanding of being as a learning process is based on an illusion. . . . They are unrevisable from within and inaccessible (meaningless) from without" (Lafont 2007, 112). In particular, there is no point in closely attending to entities in the hope of criticizing a given framework since the change from one such framework to another "can no longer be made intelligible or explained as a revision based on our intraworldly experience, but rather only as an epochal, fateful, happening of being" (Lafont 2000, 230). Heidegger himself suggests this interpretation when he plays on another meaning of *Satz*, that of "leap": each principle would thus constitute a sudden leap into a new view of being, rather than, say, a gradual progress based on careful correction and modification (GA10:132/88–89). An alternative approach, defended recently by Golob, presents Heidegger as adopting a more flexible, hermeneutic view. On this interpretation, his point is that modern science is in an important sense not genuinely empirical: for all its stress on experimentation, it is often driven by antecedent assumptions to "skip over the facts" (GA41:93). Heidegger himself is then read as articulating a new set of methodological practices, designed to identify the ways in which our understanding of an entity might be imposed on to it, rather than drawn from it (SZ 281, 182, 153; GA34:286; Golob 2014, 185–88). In short, "principles" of the type identified in GA10 and GA41 should be subjected to close hermeneutic and genealogical scrutiny which may allow for them to be displaced by a more appropriate ontology.

Sacha Golob

165.
PROXIMALLY AND FOR THE MOST PART (*ZUNÄCHST UND ZUMEIST*)

"Proximally and for the most part" is the phrase that Heidegger typically uses to refer to the way we experience things prior to any reflection upon them. This mode of experience serves as the starting point for his phenomenology of the everyday, as carried out in *Being and Time*. Macquarrie and Robinson translate the German *zunächst und zumeist* as "proximally and for the most part," while Stambaugh renders it as "initially and for the most part" (SZ 16), Kisiel as either "first and foremost" (GA20:342) or "first of all and most of all" (GA20:336), and Hofstadter as "primarily and for the most part" (GA24:231).

In *Being and Time*, the phrase first occurs in a discussion of the method that will guide Heidegger's analytic of Dasein (SZ 16–17). There, after having designated Dasein as the focal point of his approach to the question of being, Heidegger notes that his analysis of Dasein faces the methodological issue concerning how to go about "securing the kind of access which will lead to Dasein" (SZ 16). That is, to properly articulate the Dasein-structure, Heidegger must be careful not to allow any preconceived notion of the way of being of Dasein to skew his analysis. As Heidegger makes the point, "we have no right to resort to dogmatic constructions and to apply just any idea of being and actuality to this entity, no matter how 'self-evident' that idea may be" (SZ 16). Such constructions can be avoided by explicating Dasein as it appears "*proximally and for the most part*" (SZ 16). The more general methodological point is that the threat of illegitimate constructions, based on dogmatically held preconceptions of a given subject-matter, can be defused by beginning one's analysis by addressing the subject-matter as it appears proximally and for the most part.

To explicate something as it appears proximally and for the most part is to explicate it as it appears "in its average everydayness" (SZ 16), i.e., in immediate, quotidian experience. In this way, Heideggerian phenomenology answers the Husserlian call for a turn "To the things themselves" with the methodological prioritization of the everyday object. And, according to Heidegger, the objects encountered in the immediate, everyday mode are available, or equipmental, entities – things of use (see SZ 66f.). Correlatively, Dasein in its everyday mode appears as the user of the available, who "manipulates things and puts them to use" (SZ 67). For instance, a knife and a fork are immediately encountered not as, say, pieces of metal in a certain shape, but as things with which to eat, while Dasein itself appears, in such an encounter, as the user thereof.

The goal of Heidegger's turn to the everyday is not simply to describe that which appears in this mode of experience, as though the point of his analysis were to show "that the essence of man consists in the fact that he knows how to handle knives and forks or to use the tram" (GA29/30:263). Instead, Dasein's everyday experience and the objects encountered therein are to serve as a "clue," i.e., the clue to the ontological structure, the being, of that which appears in the everyday mode (see SZ 35, 66). To follow this clue is to enact the "basic component of phenomenological method – the leading back or re-duction of investigative vision from a naively apprehended entity to being – *phenomenological reduction*" (GA24:29).

An example of the Heideggerian reduction, and thus of his use of the phenomenological prioritization of that which appears proximally and for the most part, occurs in *Being and Time*'s analysis of the available, whose aim is to articulate the "availableness" (SZ 69) of such entities. And Heidegger finds that to be in this manner is to be related to other equipmental entities in such a way that these relations are intrinsic to the identity of the available entity in question (see SZ 68). For instance, a fork, being a thing with which to eat, can only play this role, and thus be the available thing that it is, insofar as it is situated among other pieces of equipment, such as a knife, a plate, a table, etc. Intrinsic to the being of the immediately encountered, available entity, then, is its being located within an "equipmental whole" (SZ 68), and thus existing in relation to other members of such a whole, rather than as an essentially isolated thing, whose relations to other essentially isolated things are merely secondary characteristics. In this way, Heidegger's methodological prioritization of the object as it is encountered in immediate, quotidian experience, i.e., as it is encountered proximally and for the most part, along with his reduction to the way of being of the object thus encountered, lays the ground for his repudiation of the traditional ontology that interprets entities as primarily isolated, self-enclosed entities – the ontology of the OCCURRENT.

Mark Tanzer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 16, 370; GA20:51, 56, 248, 252–53, 336, 342; GA24:231

FURTHER READINGS

Bernet 1994a, Crowell 2001a, Held 1988

PROXIMITY (*NÄHE*). SEE CLOSENESS.

166.
PUBLICNESS (*ÖFFENTLICHKEIT*)

Pᴜʙʟɪᴄɴᴇss ɪs "the specific ᴅɪsᴄʟᴏsᴇᴅɴᴇss of the ᴀɴʏᴏɴᴇ [*das Man*]" (SZ 167). In other words, publicness is the specific way in which phenomena are intelligible to the general public, or the way they are intelligible in the public sphere. In German the term translated as "publicness," *Öffentlichkeit*, is a commonly used term with two closely related meanings. First it means all the people of a broad community, without picking out anybody in particular. This is similar to the phrase "the general public." Second it means a sphere of discussion or conversation that is accessible to all people and that constitutes the proper venue for expressing matters that should be aired "in public," i.e., community concerns, political issues, etc. Heidegger appeals to both of these ordinary senses of the word – the general public and the public sphere – in his interpretation of publicness.

Publicness is the disclosedness of the anyone, because first and foremost the ᴡᴏʀʟᴅ we experience is a public world. Heidegger points to the obvious examples of public transportation or the public media, such as newspapers. Streetcars imply people in general, but no person in particular; they manifest a general public way of getting around, but nobody's itinerary in particular; and in knowing how to use them, we have a general understanding of our environment that does not derive from any specific, personal competence. With respect to such public things, then, "every other is like the next" (SZ 126), or everybody is like everybody else.

Heidegger's key insight about publicness is that most of the intelligibility of the everyday world is like our understanding of patently public entities. Beyond the relatively indisputable fact that we all share a general understanding of streetcars, and that with respect to public transportation our individuality dissolves into the general public, Heidegger also claims that our tastes, diversions, and judgments, even our retreats and personal soul-searching, are intelligible through the disclosures of the public. "We take pleasure and enjoy ourselves as *anyone* takes pleasure; we read, see, and judge about literature and art as anyone sees and judges; likewise we shrink back from the 'great mass' as anyone shrinks back" (SZ 126f.).

In Heidegger's hands, then, the familiar concept of publicness is interpreted as an ᴇxɪsᴛᴇɴ-ᴛɪᴀʟ feature of the anyone. In particular, "distantiality, ᴀᴠᴇʀᴀɢᴇɴᴇss, and ʟᴇᴠᴇʟɪɴɢ down as ways of being of the anyone constitute what we know as 'publicness'" (SZ 127). Publicness produces interpretations of the everyday world and everyday existence that erase differences between individuals and aims for an average, undifferentiated point of view. For the most part, this undifferentiated point of view dominates our construals of the world and of ourselves, despite the fact that it is not particularly insightful or precise. On the contrary, "publicness obscures everything, and passes along what has been thus covered up as something familiar and accessible to everyone" (SZ 127). It is nevertheless the dominant interpretation, because it disburdens Dasein in its everyday existence. We have an inherent "tendency to take things easily and make them easy" (SZ 128) and this tendency drives us to understand the world and ourselves according to the public interpretation of things.

Heidegger writes that we are "lost" in publicness. As we go about our dealings in the world and cope with our environment, we are absorbed in the world. This absorption expresses itself in the interpretations of publicness. "This 'absorption in . . .' has mostly the character of being lost in the publicness of the anyone" (SZ 175). We are "lost" insofar as such absorption into the public interpretation of the world obscures a proper self-understanding. We cannot properly understand the ontological structure of our own existence through the public interpretations. And since existence is, in part, self-understanding, if we do not properly understand ourselves, we cannot exist as an authentic Dasein. The public self-understanding is the understanding of the anyone-self, not an authentic self.

There are a few phenomena that are not accessible to the public understanding. By attending to these phenomena a Dasein can take itself back from being lost in publicness and become authentic. For example, there is no public understanding of the full existential notion of DEATH. Properly understood, death is a personal possibility that each Dasein must own. But this "ownmost" and non-relational feature of death is not intelligible to publicness, which is the disclosedness of the anyone. "The public construal of Dasein says: 'one dies,' because in this way everyone else and oneself can talk himself into saying that 'in no way is it I myself,' for this one is the nobody" (SZ 253). Similarly, there is no public understanding of the call of CONSCIENCE. Heidegger argues that conscience is a personal voice with which each Dasein summons itself into being its own self. But as long as it maintains itself in the intelligibility of the anyone, Dasein cannot hear this call. "Losing itself in the publicness and IDLE TALK of the anyone, it fails to hear its own self in listening to the anyone-self" (SZ 271).

In the final sections of *Being and Time*, Heidegger gives an analysis of how TIME is accessible to us as a phenomenon in the world, based on our own constitution as thrown, purposive temporal beings. We encounter this world-time as having significance, duration, and datability. It consists of "time to eat," "time to get up," etc., i.e., temporal intervals that make sense to us and are significant to us in terms of how they play a part in the overall meaningfulness of our everyday existence. These significant, datable moments are public. This means that your time to work might be my time to leave, etc.; it is everyone's time in which one does something. "Insofar as everyday concern understands itself in terms of the 'world' of its concern and takes its 'time,' it does not know this 'time' as its *own*, but concernfully utilizes the time which 'there is' – the time with which *anyone* reckons" (SZ 411). Publicness is therefore a basic feature of world-time.

Stephan Käufer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 126–28, 167, 175, 188–90, 252–54, 271, 411; GA9:317–19; GA20:339–42; GA24:373–74, 382–88; GA63:62–63

R

RADIATE (*SCHEINEN*). SEE SEEMING.

READINESS-TO-HAND (*ZUHANDENHEIT*). SEE AVAILABLENESS.

REALITY (*WIRKLICHKEIT*). SEE ACTUALITY.

167.
REALITY (*REALITÄT*)

REALITY IS THE kind of being of the OCCURRENT. Heidegger's employment of the language of "the real" and its "reality" (from the Latin *realis*, which calls to mind the thing, *res*, in contrast to ACTUALITY, which suggests the "being-at-work" of something) is likely to remind the reader of *Being and Time* of the well-known critique of the epistemological problem of the existence of the external world, developed in §43. In light of Heidegger's tendency in SZ to associate reality with the being of the occurrent, it comes as no surprise that the term tends to drop out of the later work, making only casual appearances after 1930, bereft of any deep and abiding philosophical import. The most interesting remarks are confined to the period between 1919 and 1927, when Heidegger is struggling to formulate a phenomenological science of being that avoids the pitfalls of objectification and a corresponding concept of reality tailored to the being of objectively present entities.

Although the concept of reality plays an important role in the earliest available writings, the conception that deserves the closest attention comes clearly into focus in the War Emergency Semester (*Kriegsnotsemester*, hereafter KNS) of 1919 (GA56/57), where it is already harnessed to the (pseudo-problem) of the brute existence of the external world, which Heidegger attacks for the first time in §16 of the course. The details of the argument are less important here than the concept of reality deployed in it, which can be compressed into three propositions: (1) In terms of the human being who relates to what exists, reality is the correlate of a detached epistemological subject, invested in the *mere* being (what Heidegger will later call *Vorhandenheit*) of anything that can possibly be said to be. (2) In terms of the object intended as real, the concept means to capture the existence of something insofar as it fails to mean or no longer means. (3) The counter-concept of the real is the environmental, the surrounding world of things that signify or show up in the light of our ongoing efforts to live a meaningful life in certain privileged practices. All three strands come together in the following representative passage: "reality is ... not an environmental characteristic, but lies in the essence of thingliness. It is a specifically theoretical characteristic. The meaningful is de-interpreted [or stripped of its significance] into this residue of being-real. Experience of the environment is no longer living, and the residue of this unliving is recognized as something real" (GA56/57:89). In this sense, the real is what remains when nothing more can be said about something save *that it is* (in a sense Heidegger will come to associate with the medieval doctrine of *existentia*), without regard for the various ways in which things can be said to be, in a way that reveals a certain blindness to what we might call *ontological diversity*.

In WS 1919–20 (GA58), Heidegger tethers the concept of reality, under the guise of thinghood (*Dinglichkeit*), to the rise of modern science, but in a way that shows more respect for the scientific enterprise – which is at least invested in the project of disclosing the structure

of specific domains or regions of BEING – at the expense of the barren problems of epistemology, whether in the shape of realism or in the guise of idealism.

Heidegger's propensity to identify reality with theoretical objectivity, and his correlation of both with detachment from the world of human significance, persist largely unaltered into the lecture courses of the mid-1920s, as is evident in the following remark about the meaningful in animal and human life in SS 1924: "These [the uplifting and the depressing in animal life and the beneficial and the harmful in human existence] are fundamental determinations: the world in natural being-here [*Dasein*] is not a fact I take notice of, is no actuality or reality; *the world is there for the most part in the mode of the beneficial and the harmful, the uplifting and the upsetting*" (GA18:47). Until 1925, then, reality is judged to be a highly derived category unsuited to the work of fundamental ONTOLOGY, except as the target of ontologically motivated criticism.

SS 1925 is the richest source of references to "the real" and "reality," a course of lectures that reads like a first working draft of the first division of SZ. And while Heidegger's use of "reality" has become somewhat more fluid – at times he appears to suggest that reality, like being, can be said in many ways – at GA20:263 Heidegger speaks of an "original reality" motivated by a certain way of having world; earlier he takes positivism to task for offering a narrow "interpretation of reality"; and on page 259 he speaks of the "reality" of the items we encounter in the work-world as synonymous with their *handiness* (a form of meaning, of course) – the vast majority of uses occur in the elaborate critique of Husserl's PHENOMENOLOGY, and embody roughly the same conceptions worked out in the preceding years, where reality means something like the being of the *mere* thing, the substance or underlying substrate of various attributes or, in Husserl's own Cartesian formulation, the being of that which requires no other being in order to be.[1]

The same ambiguity is discernible in the canonical presentation in SZ, although §43 does make an attempt to define "reality" in terms worked out throughout the early period as "the being of innerworldly entities (*res*) objectively present [or extant]" (SZ 209). And so in §43c Heidegger continues to clarify his (still thin) conception of reality as covering both the handiness of equipment and the being-extant of the mere thing; and in keeping with his critique of Dilthey's efforts, echoed in the work of Scheler, to root the concept of reality in a conception of resistance to the will, or the striving of human life, Heidegger suggests that a more adequate account of reality would have to take up the phenomenon in light of the care-structure of human existence.

James D. Reid

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA24:45–512; GA27:291–94; GA86:13–15; GA87:139–41, 143–45; GA90:240–42

FURTHER READING

Reid 2005

---

[1] See also the discussion of Husserl and the problem of psychologism in WS 1925–26 (GA21), esp. 62–64.

REALIZATION (*VOLLZUG*). SEE ACTUALIZATION.

RECOGNIZE (*ERKENNEN*). SEE COGNITION.

RECOLLECTION (*ERINNERUNG*). SEE REMEMBRANCE.

168.
REFERENCE (*VERWEISUNG*)

A REFERENCE IS AN essential structural feature of worldly entities, namely, the way such entities always send or direct their user to something else. The German word for "reference" – *Verweisung* – is also sometimes translated "assignment." The verb *verweisen* means to refer in the sense of literally sending one person to another person, in the way that a doctor refers a patient to a specialist. References are constitutive of EQUIPMENT, because "strictly speaking, there 'is' never just one equipment. To the being of equipment a whole of equipment always belongs. Within this whole, the equipment can be this equipment that it is" (SZ 68). A bicycle, for instance, requires shoes, air pumps, and roads, and encourages helmets and gloves and glasses and biking shorts. Each item of equipment performs a particular role within this equipmental WHOLE. Each item of equipment, as Heidegger puts it, "is essentially something, in order to . . ." (SZ 68). The essential "in-order-to" of equipment allows us to see that, within the structure of equipment, "there lies an assignment or reference [*eine Verweisung*] of something to something" (SZ 68). To say that equipment essentially has a reference means that equipment, when it is taken up and used, sends the user to something else – another item of equipment, another activity, and so on. And so, equipment always belongs to a "referential whole" (SZ 69–70).

AVAILABLE entities, in general, are only discovered when they "have been referred to something" (SZ 84), and it is in terms of that to which it is referred that the specific usefulness or serviceability of a thing is established (SZ 83–84). Each item of equipment refers to multiple other things, including what it is usable for (its "toward-which"), the material from which it is made (its "whereof"), and the agent who typically uses it (see SZ 70–71 and GA20:260–61).

Indeed, in some sense what we initially grasp is not any particular individual item, but this whole arrangement of references. We subsequently abstract out from that whole particular items of equipment. Because it is the interwoven and mutually sustaining structure of references that gives coherence to our activity, Heidegger suggests that "references and referential wholes could in some sense become constitutive for worldhood itself" (SZ 76). "It is not things but references," Heidegger argues, "which have the primary FUNCTION in the structure of encounter belonging to the world; not substances but functions" (GA20:272).

Ordinarily, we are not thematically or explicitly aware of the individual references or the referential wholes that are constitutive of an entity, but we are constantly guided by them (see SZ 74–75). Indeed, in fluid COPING, we may not attend at all to the entities which sustain the reference relationships. In "a genuine relation" to a tool – that is, when we are "occupied with it when using it" – "the tool . . . becomes absorbed in the reference" (GA20:259). Items of equipment, with their constitutive references, are only made salient when something disturbs the referring function, impeding our ability to be guided fluidly and directly from one thing to that to which it refers: "in a *disturbance of the reference* – in the unusability for its purpose – the reference becomes explicit" (SZ 74–75). That is to say, as long as everything is functioning properly, we are circumspectively absorbed in the

references that constitute the availableness of an equipmental whole without any explicit awareness of those references as such (SZ 76).

Heidegger distinguishes several different kinds of reference. Equipment refers by guiding us from one affordance to the next as we carry on a purposive activity. Signs employ a special form of reference – namely, they indicate or point out, thus making something salient (SZ 77–78). An appearance (see SEEMING) refers to something else which does not appear (GA20:112–13).

Mark A. Wrathall

169.
REFLECTION (*BESINNUNG*)

R EFLECTION OR MINDFULNESS IS A stance that involves us in the SENSE or meaning of things. In §16 of *Contributions* Heidegger defines philosophy as a knowledge that does not seek to be "useful" and that arises from within reflection on or mindfulness of the sense that informs our engagement with the world. Reflection is not only a source of philosophical knowing, it is also described as a qualified form of *questioning*, namely that questioning that inquires into the "sense" – the *Sinn* – of BEING. To this Heidegger adds that philosophy as reflection is also necessarily self-reflection (*Selbstbesinnung*, §19), which colloquially means "self-directed contemplation," but which Heidegger uses to mean a heightened sensibility or awareness of ourselves as selves. It is a mode of reflection that calls ourselves into question, forcing us to contemplate "who we are." The importance of this particular notion is stressed by the fact that after having finished *Contributions*, Heidegger named his next work simply *Besinnung* (GA66). There he writes that philosophy today must be a "a reflection on itself" (*Besinnung auf sich selbst*, §13). Also in the subsequent *The History of Being*, he speaks of reflection as "the leap into the highest thinking and as attunement to the most simple thrownness of Da-sein" (GA69:120). In the 1953 essay "Wissenschaft und Besinnung" he again contrasts these two modes of theoretical activity, and in the seminal text *Gelassenheit* from 1959 he concludes that "there are two forms of thinking, calculating thinking and reflective meditation [*besinnliche Nachdenken*]" (GA16:520/DT 46). These examples suffice to show the great importance that Heidegger attaches to this particular theme, as a mode and comportment of thinking.

When discussing Heidegger in English, the problem of *Besinnung* poses an unusually complicated problem of translation. The term has no obvious counterpart in English. A standard dictionary translation is simply "consciousness." The verb *besinnen* can mean to reflect or to think, but also to be aware or conscious of something, as well as to remember, and more importantly, to come to one's senses. In addition, Heidegger chooses the word because of its root word *Sinn* – "sense" or "meaning." The verb *besinnen* thus means literally to receive the sense, sensation, or meaning of the things we encounter. The closest counterpart to the term in English is perhaps "sensibility," which means both to possess the capacity for sensation, to possess mental awareness or understanding, and to have an affective or emotional grasp of the sense of things. But unlike *Besinnung*, which denotes an activity, "sensibility" denotes a mere capacity. The most accurate, but unwieldy, translations might be something like "reflection on the sense of things," or "sensible reflection."

Existing English-language translations of the term have tended to focus on the aspects of mental awareness or consciousness to the exclusion of the other elements of the meaning of the term. In the Macquarrie/Robinson translation of *Being and Time*, the compound *Selbstbesinnung* is transmitted as "consideration of the self," whereas Joan Stambaugh instead chooses "self-reflection" (SZ 399). In one English journal review of the original German *Gesamtausgabe* volume *Besinnung*, it is rendered as "deliberation" (Dahlstrom 2000). In the Rojcewicz/Schuwer translation of the contemporary *Basic Questions of Philosophy* it is "reflection," which

is a common but unfortunate choice since it erases the distinction between *Besinnung* and *Reflexion* in Heidegger (see, e.g., GA45:35). The need to preserve this distinction was essential for the choice of "mindfulness" in the first translation of *Contributions* (GA65) by Parvis Emad and Ken Maly from 2000.[1] *Mindfulness* was also the title of the English translation of the book *Besinnung* (GA66) by Parvis Emad and Thomas Kalary in 2006. Yet, when *Contributions* was translated a second time by Richard Rojcewicz and Daniela Vallega-Neu in 2012, they chose instead to render it as "meditation."[2] All of these choices have their merits and shortcomings, but together they make it clear that this particular notion poses unusual difficulties. Perhaps the multitude of suggested renderings also partly explains why this central topic in Heidegger has received so relatively little attention in the English-speaking secondary literature.[3]

The translations of *Besinnung* tend to waver between a theoretical and an ethical-practical dimension of the word. "Mindfulness" and "consideration" share the aspect of a certain responsibility and caring for what is being contemplated, whereas "examination" and "reflection" indicate a more neutral theoretical stance. The German word *Besinnung*, like the English "sensibility," definitely conveys an ethical quality. To practice sensibility is to be sensible, i.e., to practice a certain kind of moderation. One key to its semantic value in philosophical German is the fact that in his translation of Plato, Schleiermacher chose *Besonnenheit* (the perfect participle of *besinnen*) as the equivalent of *sophrosyne*, one of the four cardinal virtues, which in English has been rendered in a variety of ways: temperance, prudence, self-restraint, self-control, moderation, or simply being-sensible.[4]

Heidegger's adoption of this concept for his own purposes does not seem to issue directly from his understanding of Greek ethical thought, nor directly from Schleiermacher. Still it can be traced to his inheritance through Dilthey, in whose work on the task of historical thinking "reflection" is charged with a significance which directly anticipates its role in Heidegger's writings. For Dilthey self-reflection is the term for the kind of historical reflection which brings previous life-expressions to *articulation* by living with and through them. As Gadamer writes in *Truth and Method*, Dilthey's starting point is the intimate connection between life and theoretical knowledge. Philosophical self-reflection is a continuation of a reflective sensibility already present in life itself (Gadamer 2004, 230). It is tied directly to his criticism of an objectifying approach in the human studies, and to his ideal of hermeneutics as a unique access to previous meaning-formations, but also to an idea of how historical studies can activate and motivate life in the present.

When Husserl in his later writings appropriates this notion as the highest ideal for phenomenological reflection, he speaks in a vein similar to Dilthey, but from the philosophically much more elaborated platform of transcendental phenomenology. In *Cartesian Meditations* he equates radical and universal *Selbstbesinnung* with the phenomenological method itself, in the form of an "intentional self-explication [*Selbst-auslegung*] of the transcendental ego" which is made possible by the transcendental reduction (Husserl 1977a, 159; Husserl 1991, 153). In the very last lines of this book he speaks also of this ideal as universal self-knowledge

---

[1] Heidegger 2000, xxxii f. Mindfulness is said to carry the connotation "open, attentive, aware, heedful, care-ful."

[2] *Contributions to Philosophy (of the Event)* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2012).

[3] In Inwood 1999 (215) it is discussed briefly under the general heading of "Thinking and Questioning," with the remark that *Besinnung* marks a self-reflexive mode of thinking, as opposed to object-oriented scientific thought. In Feick and Ziegler (1991), *Besinnung* is also mentioned but only to refer it to the general question of being.

[4] For Schleiermacher's translation, see, e.g., Plato 1977.

(*Selbsterkenntnis*) and also a self-accountable (*selbstverantwortliche*) genuine science. Ordinary and mundane positive science is science "lost in the world" (*in der Weltverlorenheit*), which can only be remedied by a universal "self-examination" (*Selbstbesinnung*), whereby the world itself is regained.

In the work of both Dilthey and Husserl, the specific notion of reflection thus obtains a philosophical methodological significance of the highest possible rank. For both of them it is a name for a mode of thinking necessitated by the historical situatedness of thought, which also holds out a promise for a dispersed and alienated subjectivity to restore itself precisely through an increased historical awareness, by attuning itself to previously unarticulated original meaning-formations.

In 1923 Heidegger reads the correspondence between Dilthey and Count Yorck von Wartenburg. In Yorck he found a radicality that was missing in Dilthey. In his Kassel lecture from 1924 he ends by stating that the historical-philosophical question must be led back to the question of being itself, as posed by the ancients, but that this can only be accomplished through a reflective historical sensibility (*Besinnung*), in a way of which Yorck is said to have been more deeply aware than Dilthey. In *Being and Time*, where Yorck is given an exceptional position in §77, Heidegger cites the following quote from one of his letters at length: "The entire psycho-physical datum is not one that *is* . . . but one that lives; this is the germinal point of historicity. And if the reflection on the self is directed not at an abstract 'I' but at the fulness of my Self, it will find me historically determined, just as physics knows me as cosmically determined. Just as I am Nature I am history" (SZ 402). The quotation is particularly noteworthy for how it connects a radical sense of historicity – life as fully and irreducibly historical – with the ideal of a reflective sense of the self (*Selbstbesinnung*). The self that is the concern of this mindful reflection is explicitly dissociated from an abstract Ego. It is a self that through reflection does not return to a fixed point or foundation, but which, precisely through this reflection is revealed as historical through and through. Reflection on the self is no longer primarily the means by which the self appropriates itself through a recapitulative return journey to the originary meaning-formations leading up to the present. Instead it is the reflexive operation in and through which thinking confronts its own conditioned nature.

A central motive throughout *Contributions* is its radicalization of the historical mode of thinking, and this is directly tied to the ideal of reflection. In order to achieve a more originary "enjoining into history" we need to practice a certain mode of reflection that does not place what is to be understood within an established chronology, but which somehow permits the historical sense in being to appear. The situation could be described in terms of a complex balance of passivity and activity. To step into the sway of historical being is to recognize an indebtedness and then to think actively from within this indebt-edness itself. Only by constantly keeping this in mind, can thinking avoid falling back into a representational mode of thought.

In *Contributions* §19 Heidegger remarks that reflection is necessarily also a reflection on the self. Yet, it should not therefore be equated with "securing the 'self'-certainty of the 'I.'" Instead it should be the *questioning* of the self, as well as of the I and the we. The question concerning the self does not seek the self as a possession, as knowledge and certitude, but rather as an abandonment to the ADAPTATION of the truth of being. In Heidegger's version of philosophical reflection on the self, the self does not recover itself as a foundation; instead it is led toward the historical happening of sense or meaning and of truth, in and through which it also receives

itself as itself an event of meaning. It cannot step behind or above this ongoing process, and it can reflect and possess it only on the condition that it also recognizes itself as possessed by it. When it reaches for a historical origin and foundation it does not, unlike the transcendental ego of universal reflection, experience itself as implicitly present in previous meaning formations, but it experiences itself as handed over to itself by the historical happening of truth to which it belongs. To practice reflection is therefore also to practice a certain kind of moderation with regard to fixed forms of knowledge and with regard to the very desire to possess. In reflection the thinking subject is opened up toward itself as thrownness, as destiny, as belonging and inheritance, but not as a negative form of possession, but as the "useless" (*nutzlos*) questionability of itself and of being.

In his 1953 lecture "Wissenschaft und Besinnung" Heidegger writes: "To get involved in the sense, is the essence of reflection (*Besinnung*). This means more than simply being conscious of something. We have not yet arrived at reflection when we are only conscious of something. Reflection is more. It is RELEASEMENT towards the questionable" (GA7:63/QCT 180). In this late text Heidegger speaks of reflection in a way that gathers the themes that have been traced here. In this remark he connects the question of sense or meaning with a qualified attitude of thinking, insisting that the matter and mood of thought cannot be separated. Only then can the freedom and openness for what calls for thinking be upheld and enacted.

Hans Ruin

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA6.1:75–82/N1 77–83; GA7:36/QCT 35; GA45:122–26; GA47:194–98; GA49:43–47; GA65: 41–45; GA66: 20–25; GA69:106–10; GA76: 87–99

FURTHER READING

Ruin 2005b

REIGN (*WALTEN*). SEE PREVAILING.

170.
RELATION (*BEZIEHUNG*)

A RELATION IS A connection that draws together entities. Heidegger has a deeply relationalist account of what it is to be an entity. Entities are holistically constituted by their relations (*Beziehungen*) – actual and possible, diachronic and synchronic, causal and logical and motivational – to other entities, activities, aims, and the unfolding of events. In *Being and Time*, for example, Heidegger demonstrates that EQUIPMENT is holistically constituted through contexts of significance, contexts of AFFORDANCES, contexts of REFERENCE to other items of equipment, by purposive structures of the in-order-to, grounded in turn in the FOR-THE-SAKE-OF-WHICH. The relations that are most salient to us produce for us a network of intelligibility. Entities appear at the stable nodes of this network of relationships.

Heidegger's later work continues and develops this relationalism. He argues, for instance, the UNCONCEALMENT OF BEING requires a CLEARING that, in a sense, clears out the dense thicket of relations, so that some relations can stand out as definitive and essential while others recede. He also argues that ART can play a vital role in determining which relations are central and which marginal in a given WORLD. A world coalesces around a work of art, which

> first fits together and at the same time gathers around itself the unity of those paths and relations in which birth and death, disaster and blessing, victory and disgrace, endurance and decline acquire the shape of destiny for human being. The all-governing expanse of this open relational context is the world of this historical people. (GA5:27–28/20–21)

In an established world, the relations that play a defining or constitutive role all share a certain style that can be inferred or abstracted from the entities within that world. Heidegger refers to this common relational style as "BEINGNESS." The HISTORY OF BEING is essentially an account of the sequence of more or less stable styles of relational contexts that have prevailed in the West since the time of the Greeks.

Heidegger also develops a dynamic account of being, i.e., BEYNG, according to which beyng should be understood as imposing a kind of gravitational warp to the field of possible relationships – a warp that lets some relationships stand out as salient because others disappear into the gaps or folds of the field. Thus, even though beyng is not an entity and makes no concrete appearance in the world, it is not an inert nothing, an "indeterminate emptiness into which something 'appears'" (GA69:123). It is finite and rich because it is a particular texturing of the field, and thus allows very specific relationships to emerge as definitive of entities in the world.

Mark A. Wrathall

171.
RELEASEMENT (*GELASSENHEIT*)

R ELEASEMENT IS THE way human beings in their innermost essence belong to the open-region as the abiding expanse that lets each thing arise (GA77:145/95, 114/74). This means that humans can be said to belong to releasement and could never be outside it (GA77:55/78). Nevertheless, Heidegger also believed at the same time that, as a result of the ABANDONMENT OF BEING (*Seinsverlassenheit*) that culminates in MACHINATION and the devastation, humans also find themselves separated from the open. So the task of the THINKING of releasement is for humans to bring themselves back into accord with being. This is why releasement is also his tentative word for the essence of thinking, understood as a restful or passive waiting where we leave open that for which we are waiting (GA77:116/75–76). These two aspects of releasement come together in the formulation: "we belong to that upon which we wait" (GA77:122/79).

Given the prominence that the term releasement has played in Heidegger scholarship, non-specialists might be surprised to learn that it is a relatively rare word in his corpus. Indeed, given the fact that he introduced this word as part of his attempt to determine the essence of thinking, it is extraordinary to think that it does not appear once in *What is Called Thinking?* (GA8), a text that belongs to the period when Heidegger seems to have been most drawn to the word. Apart from two enigmatic thought-poems, each of which was entitled "Releasement" (GA81:75, 319), it is only in two texts, one of which appeared in two versions, that he made any effort to elucidate what he meant by the word. The most extended discussion is to be found in a dialogue entitled *Anchibasie.* The title is borrowed from Heraclitus in whose corpus it constitutes a single-word fragment (Fragment 121). Heidegger understood it to mean "letting oneself into nearness," which is what the dialogue attempts (GA77:155/102). The subtitle of this text is "A Triadic Conversation on a Country Path between a Scientist, a Scholar, and a Guide" and it was written during the last two years of the Second World War but not published until 1995 when it appeared with two other dialogues (GA77:1–157). Roughly one-third of "A Triadic Conversation on a Country Path" first appeared in a slightly modified form in 1959 in a volume entitled *Gelassenheit.* This 1959 volume also included the other text in which Heidegger addressed releasement, albeit he did so only briefly: it was a memorial address for the composer Conradin Kreutzer (1780–1849) delivered in October 1955 (GA16:517–29/DT 43–57). The 1959 volume was translated into English under the title *Discourse on Thinking* (DT).

The German word *Gelassenheit*, which in philosophical works throughout the tradition can best be understood to mean something like serenity, has come to mean in common parlance a certain equanimity or composure usually, but not always, in the face of some threat or disaster. With this word Heidegger wanted to address the threat both to rootedness (*Bodenständigkeit*) and to meditative thinking represented by the dominance of TECHNOLOGY. In response to this threat and as a way to release the meaning hidden in technology, Heidegger proposed releasement toward things and openness to the MYSTERY. Although Heidegger was clear that this did not amount to a simple refusal of technology, he presented this releasement and opening both as

a way of enduring the technological world and at the same time a path to another possible way of DWELLING in the world that would allow for a new rootedness (GA16:527–28/DT 54–55). However, this is about as far as the memorial address for Kreutzer takes us. To learn more about what Heidegger meant by releasement we have to rely almost exclusively on the dialogue written in the years 1944–45.

"A Triadic Conversation on a Country Path" is not always easy to interpret because of the close interplay between the three speakers, even after one recognizes that the guide or teacher speaks for Heidegger himself. But the fundamental difficulty lies with the matter at hand and the dialogue-form perhaps suggested itself to Heidegger for his only sustained attempt to elucidate releasement because it is well suited to the task of exploring what cannot be said directly. Although the limitations of the language of science and scholarship are most clearly indicated by the occasional missteps of the scientist and the scholar, the guide himself can only operate with hints and pointers. Hence the significance of the moment when the guide suggests that releasement was perhaps experienced in the course of the conversation, thereby keeping with Heidegger's insistence that releasement is not a state but a path (GA77:149/97).

As with the 1955 address, "A Triadic Conversation" begins with a discussion of technology and the powers of annihilation that it has unleashed and which threaten not only human life, but also the essence of the human (GA77:17–21/11–13). In the background is Heidegger's interpretation of technology and machination as manifestations of Nietzsche's will to POWER seen from the HISTORY OF BEING. This helps to explain why Heidegger in the conversation turns toward non-willing in order to escape the dominance of technology. Straightforward opposition to the will is unable to serve as an effective form of escape because it remains defined by what it seeks to avoid (GA77:51/33). Nevertheless, the path from willing to releasement through non-willing quickly runs into problems because of the apparent need to will this non-willing. The problem is clarified when it emerges that non-willing in the appropriate sense takes the form of a renunciation that is itself predicated on a releasement that is admitted (*zugelassen*) from elsewhere (GA77:107–08/69–70). In keeping with this, the term *Gelassenheit* no doubt suggested itself to Heidegger because he wanted his readers to hear in *Gelassenheit* the *lassen* or "letting" of *Seinlassen* in the sense of letting-be.

Releasement belongs to the open-region, which, when thought in relation to the human, is that which comes to encounter us: we do not go to encounter it (GA77:113/73). For this reason releasement is also said to be a restrained enduring or perseverance (GA77:144/94). These characterizations have led to the widespread accusation of quietism leveled against Heidegger's association of releasement with non-willing, but he already addressed this charge in the course of the conversation itself. The scientist remarked that the talk of "letting" suggests a form of passivity, but the scholar immediately responded that releasement is "a higher activity than that found in all the doings of the world and in all the machinations of the realms of humankind" (GA77:108/70). They agree that it is outside the distinction between activity and passivity. One should recall here Heidegger's statement in "Letter on 'Humanism'" that "thinking acts insofar as it thinks" (GA9:313/239). This is one way in which the discussion of releasement re-determines the essence of thinking that had been lost sight of as a result of the increasing prevalence of representing (GA77:109/71). While describing releasement as "a waiting upon the self-opening of the open region" (GA77:122/79), the conversation partners agree that it was not a waiting on anything specific: "as soon as we represent to ourselves and bring to a stand that

for which we wait, we are no longer waiting." That is to say, this waiting leaves open what we wait upon (GA77:116/75).

The term releasement has an extensive history within philosophy of which Heidegger was well aware. In "A Triadic Conversation" he referenced Meister Eckhart's use of the term but cautioned that, like other "old masters of thought," Eckhart thought of it still within the domain of the will (GA77:109/70). This remark has spawned a host of scholarly works relating Heidegger to Eckhart, some of which are certainly worth reading in their own right, whatever one thinks about their attempts to use Eckhart to try to illuminate what Heidegger wrote about releasement. It has to be said, however, that in spite of his long-standing interest in Eckhart, Heidegger seems here to be going out of his way to distance himself from Eckhart's usage of the word. Furthermore, the general point he is making amounts to a blanket statement that Eckhart and the other thinkers who used the word, like Jacob Boehme and Schelling, remained under the sway of Western metaphysics, a thesis Heidegger was obliged to maintain if his account of the history of Western metaphysics culminating in machination was to hold. For these reasons Heidegger was probably not directing his readers to Eckhart's sole use of the word in *Talks of Instruction*, a text, in any case, whose authorship has been debated. In *Talks of Instruction*, *Gelassenheit* was introduced as a synonym for Eckhart's preferred word, which was detachment (*Abgeschiedenheit*), but there is a reason why Heidegger preferred *Gelassenheit* to *Abgeschiedenheit*, even apart from the word-play with *Seinlassen* and *Seinsverlassenheit*. Unlike detachment, releasement is as much a releasement toward as a releasement from, but because it is easier to say what it moves from than what it moves toward, its negative aspect can easily dominate our understanding of it. It is a response to machination, but at the same time already another INCEPTION. This is hinted at in the course of a discussion of Georg Trakl's poem "The Word." Heidegger, while discussing the poet's experience with language that led him to renunciation, explained that the poet's sadness amounts to "a mood of releasement into the nearness of what is withdrawn but at the same time held in reserve for an originary advent" (GA12:159/OWL 66). The phrase is complex but nicely captures the sense in which releasement, like machination to which it is a response, has a Janus head (GA14:63/TB 53). That is to say, it has a double aspect in the sense that it awaits what comes by recollecting and coming to terms with what has been.

Robert Bernasconi

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA13:37–74; GA16:517–29/DT 43–57; GA77:1–157; GA81:75, 319

FURTHER READING

Cattin 2012, Davis 2007, Völker 1972

RELEVANCE (*BEWANDTNIS*). SEE AFFORDANCE.

172.
REMEMBRANCE (*ERINNERUNG*)

Remembrance is a distinctive orientation toward HISTORY; especially, the history of philosophy. Remembrance is, namely, a way of being attuned to history as fundamentally disclosing "the relationship between the HUMAN BEING and BEING" (GA6.2:440/EP 76). So conceived, remembrance takes on a special significance in the context of Heidegger's search for a way to overcome what he regards as the nihilistic trajectory of Western METAPHYSICS. (See NIHILISM.) Against the background of this trajectory, Heidegger thinks there is both the need and the opportunity for thinkers in our time to return to the history of Western metaphysics, so as to ponder anew the dynamic relationship it discloses between human beings and being. Heidegger envisages that a time of such remembrance will enable us to appreciate the contingency of the actual development of the metaphysical tradition and, ultimately, to recover from this history "another beginning" (GA45:116, 123–26, 184, 190, 196, 199, 222; GA65:21–22, 434); that is, a radical alternative to the trajectory that, so he claims, leads to modern nihilism.

The German verbal noun used by Heidegger to name remembrance is *Erinnerung*, also variously translated as "recollection" or "recall." It might more literally be rendered "interiorization" (*Er-innerung*). An important part of the historical context for Heidegger's use of this term is Hegel's contrast between *Erinnerung*, as the internalization of a sensory image, and *Gedächtnis*, as memory of a higher cognitive order, memory proper. For Heidegger, however, *Erinnerung* is no mere starting point in a series of successively higher phases of representation. For he holds that remembrance presupposes forgetfulness (SZ 339); and he holds that the FORGETFULNESS OF BEING is part and parcel of Dasein's finitude, being "necessarily and constantly formed" (GA3:233). These claims inform Heidegger's governing conception of philosophy as determined by the principle of ontological difference, viz. the distinction between entities and being. Philosophy, in Heidegger's view, must work to counteract the forgetfulness of being that manifests itself in the human preoccupation with things in the foreground of our experience: that which is present, entities. What it is ours to forget, he thinks, is the background or the OPEN out of which entities emerge for us in determinate, historically situated ways. Moreover, Heidegger maintains that this forgetfulness or "oblivion" is inscribed in the metaphysical tradition itself, not least in its grounding distinction between ESSENCE and EXISTENCE (GA9:243/186). It follows that "the basic fundamental-ontological act" is a "remembering again," where "true remembering ... must at all times interiorize what is remembered, i.e., let it again come closer and close in its innermost POSSIBILITY" (GA3:233).

In "Recollection in Metaphysics" ("Die Erinnerung in die Metaphysik"), Heidegger defines remembrance by a *via negativa*, by contrast with various other, more familiar, approaches to history, and especially to the history of philosophy. These more familiar approaches, which Heidegger subsumes under the rubric of "historiography," include tracing lines of influence from earlier to later philosophers, summarizing bodies of doctrine, comparing opinions or worldviews, providing narratives about the development and progression of the history of ideas,

and the like. But Heidegger is emphatic: remembrance "does not report on past opinions and representations about being" (GA6.2:443/EP 77). More: because of its essential connection with "innermost possibility" (GA3:233), remembrance is not, fundamentally, a backward-looking stance at all. It is not essentially directed toward past actualities and it is not essentially about describing events that have already taken place. On the contrary, as Heidegger puts it with more than a hint of paradox, remembrance is a "thinking ahead to the Origin" (GA6.2:448/EP 83). Likewise, in his Hölderlin-inspired view of the founding work of the poet, the poet is one who "thinks of what-has-been in his thinking of what-is-coming" (GA4:107/130; GA10:140–41/94).

Heidegger is perhaps clearer about what remembrance is not than what it is. An illustration may help. Imagine an artist – a painter, say, or a playwright – who fears she is "selling out" to commercial pressures. Her work, so she fears, is becoming dull, hollow, routine. In the face of this threat of atrophy, she wants to reawaken the original creative sensitivity to the world that first inspired her to artistic work. Very plausibly, it would not be enough, given this aim, for the artist merely to remind herself about the various causes and events leading up to her first artistic activity. Rather, what she is looking for is a way to reattune herself to the kind of responsiveness to the world that called her to creative work in the first place. Heidegger evidently thinks that something akin to such a process of reattuning is called for in relation to the history of philosophy and with respect to the kind of responsiveness that first called human beings to the work that we now call metaphysics. Such remembrance, as he puts it picturesquely, "returns to the claim of the soundless voice of being and to the manner of its attuning" (GA6.2:484/EP 77).

The idea of remembrance comes to the fore in the 1930s and 1940s, in his Nietzsche and Hölderlin lectures and against the backdrop of Heidegger's concern with "European nihilism." In this regard, however, this work stands in strong thematic continuity with the dominant emphasis in earlier work on the need to "reawaken" the question of the SENSE of being. According to its Foreword, such reawakening is indeed the first aim of *Being and Time*. And, from his earliest work, Heidegger conceives of philosophy, as tasked with investigating the question of the sense of being, in terms of a process of excavating the "pre-ontological" understanding that, underneath the radar, structures the ways things manifest themselves in everyday life. "Being," as he put it in 1928, "is what we recall" (GA26:186).

In its later form, however, Heidegger's account of remembrance is marked by two key ideas. First, it is bound up with the idea of a HISTORY OF BEING. In remembrance, in Heidegger's later view, history discloses the relationship between human beings and being, not as something static and universal but as a dynamic, culturally situated process which shifts and turns and crystalizes into discrete epochs. Second, remembrance is conceived as a kind of preparation and, moreover, one that is itself a sort of gift or "bestowal" (GA6.2:440/EP 75–76). The key point here is that, if we take as our aim something like the "overcoming" of Western metaphysics, or a radical "REPETITION" of the philosophical tradition, Heidegger thinks we must recognize that achieving these goals is not under the direct control of our wills. Accordingly, the vital importance of remembrance, against the background of Heidegger's diagnosis of the maladies of our present age, lies in its capacity to prepare the thinker, or poet, for a new dispensation. Moreover, this very process of preparing and cultivating is itself conceived as a "bestowal" which is granted by our historical situation, inasmuch as what provokes us in our time to ponder anew the history of being is the very salience of the dangers associated with nihilism. Hence, for

Heidegger, the significance of Hölderlin's saying that where the danger grows, there also grows "the saving power" (GA7:29/QCT 42).

Daniel Watts

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA1:80, 121, 132, 140, 141, 169, 180, 276, 377; GA3:41, 70, 176, 177, 185, 197, 218, 233, 241, 246; GA5:37/28; GA7:79/EP 93–94; GA14:45, 49, 135; GA15:337, 344, 374, 384, 419, 439/FS 42, 47, 65, 71; GA17:148, 204; GA18:199, 202, 284; GA20:17, 37, 45; GA21:261, 262; GA22:112, 262, 308; GA23:164; GA24: 81, 411–12, 464–65; GA25:406; GA26:9–10, 18, 28, 179, 181, 186–87, 257, 263–64; GA27:204, 321, 336, 365, 372, 394, 398–99; GA28:36, 46, 55, 92, 133, 166, 237, 277, 287, 311, 365; GA29/30:29, 168, 233, 318, 388, 428, 509; GA31:40; GA32:91; GA33:153; GA36/37:97, 144; GA39:111, 123, 270; GA41:20; GA42:99, 107, 151, 167, 260, 271; GA45:193, 202, 205, 208, 219–22; GA46:35, 36, 41–50, 70–73, 100, 107, 112, 151–53, 227, 270, 286, 355; GA47:94, 100, 247; GA49:96, 119, 157, 160, 163; GA51:7–11, 21–22, 65–68, 86–88, 92–93, 101, 123; GA52:23–24, 42, 52–54, 120–26, 161–65; GA53:34; GA54:28, 34, 141, 145, 184, 207; GA55:104, 231, 263, 365; GA56/57:20, 100, 161; GA58:53, 106, 111, 159, 222, 229, 245, 252; GA63:1; GA64:1, 107; GA65:73, 107, 119, 157, 257, 335, 338, 344, 350, 359, 398, 423, 472; GA66:35, 37, 95, 97, 135, 195, 230, 244, 277, 349, 367; GA67:101, 148; GA69:101; GA75:10, 14, 218, 224, 253; GA76:95, 98, 144, 274; GA79:50; GA85:45, 191; GA90:29, 142, 277, 309, 343, 411

FURTHER READING

Comay and McCumber 2009, Düttmann 2002, Guignon 2005, Malpas 2006, McNeil 2013b, Mugerauer 2008, Wrathall 2000

REMINISCENCE (*ANKLANG*). SEE RESONATING.

REMOTED DISTANCE (*ENTFERNUNG*). SEE DIS-STANCE.

REMOTION (*ENTFERNUNG*). SEE DIS-STANCE.

REMOVAL (*ENTFERNUNG*). SEE DIS-STANCE.

173.
REPETITION (*WIEDERHOLUNG*)

R EPETITION IS THE process in which the original potential of a received form of thought or existence gets released anew. As officially introduced in *Being and Time*, repetition describes a specific mode of projective self-understanding. It is, namely, the mode of self-understanding in which "DASEIN brings itself again forth into its ownmost ABILITY-TO-BE" (SZ 339). So conceived, repetition is central to Heidegger's answer to the question of how it is possible for beings like us to maintain self-constancy across TIME.

Wiederholung is variously translated as "repetition" and "retrieval." An important part of the philosophical context for Heidegger's use of the term is the writings of Søren Kierkegaard, not least his enigmatic little book called *Repetition* (*Gjentagelsen*) and translated into German as *Die Wiederholung*. More directly than the English word "repetition" – from the Latin *petere*, to make for, seek, beseech – both the Danish and German words connote the idea of a taking(up)-again.

Kierkegaard's *Repetition* introduces its central category, with some fanfare, as a modern counterpart to the notion of recollection so central to ancient Greek thought. For Kierkegaard, repetition is the category without which, absent a full-blooded Platonic metaphysics of recollection, we moderns could only regard existence in time as so much meaningless noise.

Taking up Kierkegaard's lead, Heidegger associates repetition especially with "the possibility that Dasein may choose its hero" (SZ 385). This association relies on the connection between the idea of self-constancy – the idea of one's repeatedly taking up the way of being that is most properly one's own – and the idea of following a model or exemplar. In "choosing a hero," one relates to the exemplar not merely as an example, i.e., as merely something which happens to instantiate some course of action or form of life, but as a locus for the retrieval of possibilities for the future. For Heidegger (as for Kierkegaard) this means that repetition involves a forward-looking stance on one's history, both personal and cultural: in repetition, DASEIN relates to its past not as a sequence of finished occurrences but as a site of latent possibilities.

Crucially, it follows from this conception that what gets repeated, in the kind of repetition that makes self-constancy possible, always underdetermines how it is to be taken up again. One can never simply read off, from a description of what the exemplar has done, what it means to "go on" in the same way; and one can never simply read off, from a description of how one has realized oneself in the past, what it means to take up again one's "ownmost" way of being. As Heidegger puts it, "in repetition the 'force' of the possible gets struck home into one's factical existence – in other words . . . it comes towards that existence in its futural character" (SZ 395).

Consider one of Kierkegaard's examples. An actress, in her middle years and something of a fading star, returns to the part for which she first caused a sensation as a teenager, Shakespeare's Juliet. Kierkegaard highlights the possibility that, under these conditions, the actress might manifest a certain "metamorphosis of potentiation." He has in mind the possibility that the actress might be able to find a way to retrieve the potential latent in the role with which she has long come to be associated. In Heidegger's phrase, she might find a way to "bring

herself again forth" into the role of Juliet, rendering anew the potentialities it affords. Notably, if we are to envisage her realizing this possibility, there can be no question of her merely rocking back on past performances or of mechanical recital. In thinking about this example, however, we must also pay attention to Heidegger's expression, "Dasein's … ownmost ability to be." If Kierkegaard's actress is genuinely to count as a paradigm of repetition in Heidegger's sense, it is not enough that she merely try to breathe new life into her contingent practical identity qua nineteenth-century actress celebrated for her teenage reprisals of Juliet. Rather, she must in the process render anew her very way of being qua Dasein. Given the tight connections in Heidegger's lexicon between "Dasein," "being-in-the-world," and "understanding of being," this means that, if our actress is to serve to represent genuine repetition, we must think of her transformation as one in which she radically reappropriates the whole meaningful context in which she finds herself situated: her own past performances, the audience, Shakespeare's Juliet, and so forth. Nothing here can be treated as already settled.

The actress example helps to bring out three features of repetition. First, in its existential meaning, repetition is plainly not – as the English word may tempt us to think – a matter of mere reiteration or recital. On Heidegger's account, what get repeated are original "potentialities," not past actualities. (Compare Kierkegaard's reference to a "metamorphosis of potentiation.") Second, however, neither is existential repetition a matter of reflective rule-following, in the sense of an agent trying to base his or her actions on a mental representation of a norm or goal. The relevant distinction between mere rote conformity and repetition is not the Kantian contrast between the reflex of animal instinct and the "reflective distance" of conscious action based on repeated applications of maxims. Far from being a matter of the rigid application of rules, repetition requires being attuned to the demands of new situations – in the way a free jazz improviser might take up again the musical idea of a previous player in the collective, transforming the idea in a way that is apt for a different instrument in a different musical situation. Accordingly, in the context of his interpretation of Aristotle's ethics, Heidegger claims that "the manner and mode of habituation, in the case of action, is not practice but repetition" but immediately adds that repetition here "does not mean the bringing-into-play of a settled completedness, but rather acting anew in every moment on the basis of the corresponding resolution" (GA18:189). But third, repetition is equally not just a matter of acts of maintaining continuity by readjusting to local changes within a fixed overall framework of self-understanding. As Heidegger underlines the point in *Introduction to Metaphysics*, "Repetition as we understand it is anything but a continuation with an old method of what has been up to now" (GA40:42). By enabling Dasein to take up again its "ownmost ability to be," repetition renews the whole context of intelligibility in which one has hitherto understood oneself.

As the discussion in Division ii of *Being and Time* shows, Heidegger holds that the possibility of repetition is founded on Dasein's "historicality." As such, repetition plays an important role in Heidegger's governing strategy, in Division ii, of showing how specifically authentic modes of self-understanding provide phenomenological evidence for his general account of historicality and temporality as existential structures. Thus, he argues that the temporality of authentic repetition tells against any view in which the emergence of "the steadiness of existence" – as some philosophers would say, the formation of a stable "personal identity" – is understood as fundamentally a matter of a conjoined sequence of momentary instants (SZ 391). Rather, Heidegger speaks in this connection of "the temporality of that repetition which is futurally in the process-of-having-been – a temporality which has already been stretched along"

(SZ 391). In the proper self-understanding of repetition, the past is never simply "done and over with" and the future is not simply open-ended and yet-to-come; rather, what Dasein has been is taken up futurally, as a field of latent possibilities (see Authenticity). Correlatively, in the self-understanding of authentic repetition, I understand myself, in a very specific sense, as "fated" or "destined" – not as determined by past actualities but as called to fetch up anew the potential latent in the form of self-understanding I already inhabit (see Destiny). Heidegger wants to show how the temporal structure of authentic repetition helps to reveal the "stretched," non-sequential character of our temporality quite generally.

Illustrations of these ideas are provided by paradigm-shifting artists. Picasso, for example, is known to have made over two hundred variations in different media of Manet's *Le déjeuner sur l'herbe*, a work which itself radically challenged the tradition by (inter alia) discovering new possibilities latent in an etching of Raphael's drawing, *The Judgment of Paris*, which in turn appropriates a relief sculpture found on two ancient Roman sarcophagi. On viewing the Manet for the third time, Picasso wrote a note on the back of an envelope: "When I see Manet's *Le déjeuner sur l'herbe* I say to myself: trouble for later on!" Picasso seems here to regard the Western artistic tradition not as something fixed, to be simply continued or broken with, but as an unsettling challenge that he is fated to confront in the future. In Heidegger's terms, his artistic self-understanding is "futurally in the process-of-having-been."

From Heidegger's early lecture courses onward, repetition is especially associated with the heroes of the philosophical tradition and with a proper appreciation of philosophical problems as such. In *Prolegomena to the History of the Concept of Time* (1925), for example, in a section entitled "The Taking-Up of the Tradition as Genuine Repetition," Heidegger writes: "the taking-up of the tradition is not of necessity traditionalism and the taking-up of prejudice. The true repetition of a traditional question lets its external, traditional character just disappear and goes back before the prejudice" (GA20:187). Phenomenological ontology, he avers, is essentially "nothing but the questioning of Plato and Aristotle brought back to life: a repetition, a retaking" (GA20:184). Accordingly, the title of the opening section of *Being and Time* (§1) announces "The Necessity of an Explicit Repetition of the Question of Being" (SZ 2). As his Kant-book makes clear, moreover, Heidegger also thinks of his own early approach to the question of being as a repetition of Kant's transcendental idealism. While often put into English in these terms, the idea of a "critical appropriation" of Kant fails to capture the specificity of Heidegger's conception of a repetition or retrieval in this context. We must above all keep in mind here the idea of a rediscovery of latent potentialities. Thus, for instance, in his Kant-book, Heidegger's aim is not merely to sort out what he does and does not agree with in Kant, and to put this in his own terms, but rather to bring to light the implicit animus of Kant's project and to follow this lead in ways neglected by Kant himself and the subsequent tradition. In a phrase central to Heidegger's later thought, one searches the remains of previous philosophical endeavors for "another beginning." As Heidegger readily admits, this sort of endeavor must in a certain sense do violence to the actual products of the philosophical tradition. But, in the ideal case anyway, this violence is not a matter of foisting on past philosophers alien concepts and concerns, but, rather, of rendering anew the fundamental aporiai which, perhaps only very implicitly, served to give motivation, direction, and structure to their inquiries in the first place. "By the repetition of a basic problem," Heidegger explains, "we understand the opening-up of its original, long-concealed possibilities, through the working-out of which it is transformed. In this way it first comes to be preserved in its capacity as a problem" (GA3:206).

The theme of repetition returns throughout Heidegger's corpus. (One answer to the hotly contested question of the relationship between early and later Heidegger is that the latter is a repetition of the former.) In continuity with the image in *Being and Time* of repetition as a "reciprocal rejoinder" with the past, for example, Heidegger's 1942 essay on Hölderlin's poem "Remembrance" ("Andenken") continues to work out the idea of a "remembrance in thought," as figured by a reciprocal greeting and being greeted by the past, a "re-thinking" (*An-denken*) and a "homecoming" (GA4:83–85/108–10; see DASEIN). Likewise, *Identity and Difference* (1957) calls for a renewed kind of thinking "which accomplishes a step back, back out of metaphysics into the active essence of metaphysics," where this step back "goes from what is unthought . . . into what gives us thought" (GA11:60, 59/ID 72, 50). An important theme that comes to the fore in Heidegger's later writings, moreover, is that genuine repetition is not within our power to directly bring about. From this perspective, though you may indeed try to cultivate a kind of heedfulness to latent possibilities within a received form of self-understanding, the transformative power of repetition is not itself something you can deploy by fiat.

Daniel Watts

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 1–4, 8, 17, 26, 51, 234, 305, 308, 331, 333, 350, 385–87, 390–95, 522; GA3:206–46; GA4:92/116; GA6.2:176/N4 144–45; GA8:25/22; GA10:141/92; GA15:442, 444/FS 98, 99; GA17:277; GA18:141, 189–91, 202, 270; GA19:74, 77, 230–31, 289, 426; GA20:84, 184, 187–88, 446; GA21:197; GA22:48, 98, 112, 179, 195; GA23:64, 196; GA24:72, 407, 435; GA25:352; GA26:70, 171, 197; GA28:197, 205, 263, 285; GA29/30:410; GA32:7; GA33:96, 110, 149, 161; GA36/37:186, 201, 216, 222, 287; GA39:162, 213–38; GA40:7/5–6, 20/19, 42/41; GA42:70, 183, 233; GA46:318; GA47:118; GA49:25, 73, 141–65; GA51:76; GA52:104, 188, 201; GA53:25, 161; GA54:96, 247; GA56/57:27, 179; GA61:80, 88, 133–39; GA64:33, 39, 60, 110; GA65:57, 58, 73, 82, 185, 475; GA66:352, 421, 425, 434; GA67:129, 130, 264; GA69:22; GA75:47, 66, 293, 304, 305; GA76:132, 388; GA81:188, 221

FURTHER READING

Carlisle 2011, Carlisle 2013, Eriksen 2000, Golob 2014, Han-Pile 2013, Haugeland 2000, Kierkegaard 1997, Kierkegaard 2009, McManus 2015c, Mulhall 2001, Ruin 2005a

174.
REPRESENTATION (*VORSTELLUNG*)

Representation is a particular way of making something present to oneself by setting it before oneself as an object. This mode of making things present is distinctive of modernity. "Representation" becomes a technical term in Heidegger's writings around the middle of the 1930s, and is one of the key concepts in his diagnosis of modernity as the epoch of technology. In "The Age of the World Picture" from 1938, he defines it as follows: "to represent means to bring what is occurrent before oneself as something standing over against, to relate it to oneself, to the one representing it, and to force it back into this relationship to oneself as the normative realm" (GA5:91/QCT 131). He adds that the "original naming power" of this term is "to set out before oneself and to set forth in relation to oneself. Through this, whatever is comes to stand as object and in that way alone receives the seal of being" (GA5:92/QCT 132). In German, *sich etwas vorstellen* often means to imagine something, to make a picture of something in one's mind. We may, for example, picture to ourselves the end of World War II, form an idea of how our brain works, or entertain a notion of truth. In all these cases, we have a mental presentation (*Vorstellung*) of something that constitutes our "representation" of that particular part or aspect of the world. Herein is implied that a representation is our subjective take on reality, a kind of mental image of things that precisely re-presents rather than presents them to us as they are in themselves. Heidegger will exploit all of these implications of the concept of representation in order to show how it captures something essential about modernity: its ideal of rationality as well as the ontology that lies at the bottom of this ideal. And he will set out from the literal sense of the German verb *vorstellen*: to put (*stellen*) something before (*vor*) oneself, and in this way to single it out as an object. Representation thus always involves some degree of objectification. More precisely, in the modern epoch, the world is placed in front of man in such a way as to be transformed into a mere image of him. It is only by being represented by a cognizing subject that the world is intelligible, not to say real, at all. Or with yet another formulation, what modern science tells us is that the world of nature is nothing over and above the picture drawn of it in science. It is not so much that we now have a certain picture of the world but that the world itself has become a picture.

An important background in this respect is Heidegger's work on Kant during the 1920s and the 1930s, where his own distinctive understanding of the phenomenon of representation is not yet in place. Representation is a central concept in Kant, and in the German philosophical tradition after him it becomes quite common. Kant uses it to translate the Latin *repraesentatio*, which occurs in Leibniz, and Heidegger will also interpret Descartes' *cogitare* along the same lines. This is a major reason for translating *Vorstellung* as "representation," though in many contexts it is more accurately rendered as "idea" or "conception." Heidegger thus builds his analysis of modernity around one of its own basic concepts, which means that he can claim for his own part to merely be exploring and articulating the implications of an already existing ideal of rationality.

A central notion that is reflected in the concept of representation is that the supposedly theoretical, detached attitude actually involves an intervention in reality. To bring this out, Heidegger connects *vorstellen* with a number of other terms sharing the root *stellen*, like

herstellen (produce), *bestellen* (order), *Ge-Stell* (INVENTORY, SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT(ION)
ING) and *Bestand* (STANDING RESERVE). In short, to represent is a way of taking control of
the world, to exploit it for various uses. In this sense, to represent, *vorstellen*, is to produce,
herstellen (GA5:94/QCT 134). Here Heidegger in effect calls into question his earlier distinc-
tion between the OCCURRENT and the AVAILABLE – between *Vorhandensein* and *Zuhandensein*.
To experience things as occurrent (*vorhanden*) is really a way of experiencing them as available
(*zuhanden*), as being at the disposal of an inquiring subject. The ultimate consequence of this is
that the very objectivity of things is lost: they are no longer seen as independent objects available
for interrogation but just as a standing reserve. This is precisely what warrants the suspicion that
the world is at bottom a subjective illusion, as expressed by Descartes' famous doubt. Instead of
taking the object as it presents itself to us, modern science re-presents it in its own picture, so
that the true object of science is the representation of the world that has been set up by the
subject, which is unable to believe in the possibility of knowledge about the external world
unless it is first able to acquire certainty about itself.

But if reality needs to be secured, then it seems that it is in fact not directly at man's disposal:
"scientific representation is never able to encompass [*umstellen*] the coming to presence of
nature; for the objectness of nature is, antecedently, only *one way* in which nature exhibits
[*herausstellt*] itself" (GA7:56/QCT 174). So when man "ensnares [*nachstellt*] nature as an area of
his own conceiving [*Vorstellen*], he has already been claimed by a way of revealing that challenges
him to approach nature as an object of research" (GA7:19/QCT 19). The human representation
of things is only possible as a response to the appearance or "presentation" of the world as such,
which event cannot, accordingly, in its turn be made into an image or representation.

During the 1920s and into the first half of the 1930s, Heidegger speaks about representation with
varying degrees of frequency, notably with reference to Kant. In the following decade, the concept is
used extensively in most of his writings. Below are given references to passages in works where
Heidegger is particularly attentive to its different senses and philosophical implications.

Charlotta Weigelt

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA5:86–95/QCT 126–36; GA6.2:133–53/N4 104–22; GA7:19, 22, 45, 50, 54–62/QCT 19, 21, 162–63,
168, 172–79; GA7:240–45/EGT 82–87; GA8:41–46/39–44; GA10:28–42/18–27, and *passim*;
GA13:38, 42–51/DT 58, 62–69; GA65:202–03, 213–15; GA69:25, 115, 123; GA79:20, 25–27, 30,
39–43, 138–40
Repraesentatio and ***repraesentare*** GA5:91/QCT 131–32; GA6.2:17/N3 178; GA6.2:91/N4 65;
GA6.2:393–95, 409, 423–24, 429, 432/EP 28–29, 45, 60–62, 65, 69; GA7:83–84/EP 97–98;
GA7:141–42; GA10:34/22; GA69:133

FURTHER READING

Glazebrook 2000, 112–17, Guzzoni 2009, 63–64, Maidika 2013, 146–48, 156–57, Riis 2011, 224–30,
Taminiaux 1989a, Tresh 2007, Zimmerman 1990, 171–72

RESIDE (*WOHNEN*). SEE DWELLING.

RESIDENCE (*AUFHALT*). SEE SOJOURN.

175.
RESOLUTENESS (*ENTSCHLOSSENHEIT*)

Resoluteness is a modified way of living in the world that, rather than carrying on in conformity with generic identities and social expectation, organizes the way the concrete situation for action appears so that it sustains and guides one in the project of being one's own individual self. Heidegger invokes resoluteness as an "attestation" or "witness" of the authentic (*eigentlich*) way in which Dasein has a self, and so of Dasein's basic ontological structure, which is typically concealed or covered over (SZ 234).

Entschlossenheit (along with cognate terms: *entschließen*, *Entschluß*, *Entschlossensein*) is a term that appears across Heidegger's corpus, though the most well-known discussion occurs in Division II of *Being and Time*. Typically rendered into English as "resoluteness," *Entschlossenheit* labels a central feature of the larger concept of "AUTHENTICITY" (*Eigentlichkeit*). While ideas closely linked with resoluteness can be readily traced back to Heidegger's very earliest writings, the term itself first appears in the mid-1920s in lectures on Aristotle. After the publication of *Being and Time*, Heidegger's discussions of the term gradually become sparser. This is not to say that these later discussions do not provide important insight into the meaning of the term in Heidegger's conceptual vocabulary.

1 RESOLUTENESS BEFORE *BEING AND TIME*

Readers of *Being and Time* are likely to be familiar with the way in which the term is introduced there as a label for the "correct" or "proper" (SZ 287) response to the *call of* CONSCIENCE. Heidegger maintains that the call and this response comprise a unitary phenomenon that "attests" or "bears witness" to a way in which Dasein has a "self" in a more authentic manner (SZ 237). Dasein must be "brought back to itself" (*sichzurückholen*), which involves "deciding for an ABILITY-TO-BE [*Seinkönnen*] and making this decision from one's own self" (SZ 268). This unitary structure, which involves an experience that interrupts the normal course of Dasein's "FALLING," coupled with an alteration in the direction of a person's life, is something that Heidegger takes note of in a number of places prior to the emergence of the term "resoluteness." For example, in a May 1919 letter to his friend Elisabeth Blochmann, Heidegger writes:

> it is a rationalistic misjudgment of the essence of the personal stream of life if one intends and demands that it vibrate in the same broad and sonorous amplitudes that well up in graced moments. Such claims grow out of a defect in inner humility before the mystery and grace-character of all life. We must be able to wait for the tautly strung intensities of meaningful life – and we must remain in continuity with these moments – not so much to enjoy them as to mold them into [*eingestalten*] life – in the continuing course of life, they are taken along and incorporated into the rhythm of all future life. (Heidegger 1989, 14)

The "graced moments" that Heidegger refers to here are ones in which "we feel ourselves belonging immediately to the direction in which we live," experiences that involve "possessing oneself in understanding" (*verstehende Sichselbsthaben*), or what Heidegger calls, in *Being in Time*, projecting oneself upon one's ownmost ability-to-be (Heidegger 1989, 14). In the same letter, Heidegger cites his friend's "clear commitment [*Verhaftetsein*] to scientific work" as exemplary (Heidegger 1989, 14).

Another description of this unitary phenomenon later labeled resoluteness can be found in his winter 1920–21 lecture on Paul's epistles. Christian life is supposed to begin with a "proclamation" (*Verkündigung*) that is "continually co-actual in the enactment of life" (G60:116–17). Like the call of conscience in *Being and Time*, to which resoluteness is the "correct" or "proper" response, the proclamation is a "shock" (*Anstoß*) that "breaks in" (*einschlägt*, G60:143–44). The life in which the proclamation is "continually co-enacted" involves a profound reorientation that, in turn, gets expressed by a new sense of self or direction in life, a practical self-understanding that Heidegger characterizes in terms of "RECOLLEC-TION" and "UNDERSTANDING" (G60:95).

While these and other early discussions quite clearly anticipate the more familiar material from Division II of *Being and Time*, Heidegger does not introduce resoluteness or cognates until a lecture given in the summer of 1924, entitled *Basic Problems of Aristotelian Philosophy*. Heidegger here translates Aristotle's term *prohairesis* (variously rendered in English as "will," "intention," or "choice," and introduced by Aristotle in Book III of *Nicomachean Ethics*) into German as "being resolute" (*Entschlossensein*, G18:144). Much of Heidegger's discussion in this lecture is echoed in the winter 1924–25 course, *Plato's Sophist*, particularly in §§19–22, which examines the concept of *phronesis* in Aristotle's ethics. There, Heidegger observes how the exercise of *phronesis* involves the disclosure of the "situation" (*Lage*, i.e., the determinate circumstances of a particular action, such as the available means toward some end) to "acting Dasein" in relation to "what I have resolved" at a particular time (G19:148). Heidegger goes on to describe how, in Aristotle's conception, such "being resolved" requires or has an essential relation to deliberation. Being resolute is a "being out [*Aussein*] for something that is determined by thorough consideration" (G18:145). Such a relation is essential for the relevant resolution (*Entschluß*) to be deliberate or intentional. At the same time, Heidegger wants to stress how being resolute is oriented primarily toward what obtains in a given situation; that is, it is "an authentic possibility of being in the MOMENT" that is supposed to contrast with the kind of practical blindness from which one can suffer in a fit of passion (G18:145–46). Among other things, this entails a lucid awareness of what is *practically* (as opposed, for example, to merely logically) possible in a given situation: "*prohairesis* is always after the possible, specifically, after something determinately possible that we take up and are able to carry out in the moment" (G18:146). Only by being clear-sighted or lucid in this manner can a person work toward the end of "good action," *prakton agathon* (G18:147). Importantly, Heidegger also draws attention to the way Aristotle contrasts *prohairesis* with *doxa* (usually translated as "opinion"). Merely having an opinion "does not pertain to changing the general comportment of human beings according to their being" (*betrifft nicht die eigentliche seinsmäßige Haltung des Menschen zu anderen*, G18:147; italics in original). Clearly looking ahead to the way in which resoluteness contrasts with the everyday lostness of Dasein in the "ANYONE" (*das Man*), Heidegger observes how "the manner and mode in which I am resolved, that to which I am resolved, what stands in *prohairesis*, *is decisive for my being*, for the manner and mode in which I am, for my *ethos*" (G18:147).

2   RESOLUTENESS IN BEING AND TIME

As previously mentioned, the discussion of *resoluteness* in Heidegger's most important published work gets going in Division II, chapter 2, where he calls attention to the need for a phenomenal "witness" to an authentic possibility of Dasein. As set forth earlier in the work, particularly in the discussions of "ambiguity" and "IDLE TALK," Dasein typically and for the most part understands itself in terms of "tasks, rules and standards" that have already been "decided" by the anonymous sphere of public intelligibility Heidegger calls "the anyone" (*das Man*, SZ 268). Dasein has always already "abandoned itself" or "let itself go" (*überlassen*) into some particular possibility of its existence, e.g., into a particular social role that carries with it a more or less vague set of expectations and requirements as to how it is supposed to be carried on. This is where Dasein typically derives its sense of what matters as well as of what is practically possible (SZ 270). In doing so, however, Dasein "ignores" (*überhört*) itself while "listening intently" (*hinhören*) to "the anyone" (SZ 271). The German evokes being distracted or being unduly occupied with something other than what ought to engage one's attention. In this case, it turns out that Dasein is distracted *by* the indefinite, public sense of what is important, relevant, or worthwhile about life. Ultimately, this serves as a distraction *from* the basic character of human existence, which Heidegger describes in §58 as the "uncanniness of thrown individualization" (SZ 280).

This is the state of affairs that is interrupted by the call of conscience (§57). The "haphazard [*wahllose*] being carried along by the nobody through which Dasein is ensnared in inauthenticity, can only be rescinded if Dasein is, on its own, brought back to itself from lostness in the 'anyone'" (SZ 268). For this to be accomplished, the call must "call noiselessly and without any ambiguity, without a foothold for curiosity" (SZ 271). Importantly, the "call is indeed not, and can never be, planned, prepared for, or voluntarily enacted *from ourselves*" (SZ 275).

§58 deals with the issue of how the call is to be understood. By making this a matter of "understanding" (*Verstehen*), Heidegger signals that grasping the call is not a kind of neutral or detached cognition. Instead, the call is "understood" only when what it says is actually taken up into the direction of a person's life. Heidegger labels the content of the call by invoking the term "GUILT" (*Schuld*). As he argues at some length in §59, he is trying to capture something deeper or structurally more basic about Dasein than the received understanding of a "guilty conscience" allows for. "Guilt" is a formally indicative term for what Heidegger had described as "the UNCANNINESS of thrown individuation." He explicates this by beginning with the connotations of the concept of "guilt" as typically understood (which, in German, includes the idea of being indebted) (SZ 281). To be "guilty" is one form in which a person is subject to some claim or requirement that one can either satisfy or fail to satisfy (SZ 282).

At the deepest level, Dasein is guilty in that it is subject to the claim or requirement of *being Dasein* (SZ 284). As Heidegger explains, Dasein "reposes in the weight" of itself, lacking power over its "ownmost ability-to-be from the ground up" (SZ 284). What is at issue in guilt is not some particular obligation or requirement, but rather the generic "requirement" that one live one's own life. Dasein is always, as it were, subject to the requirement of having to exist; but, as Heidegger goes on to observe, this requirement cannot be generically fulfilled, but itself gets lived out in determinate possibilities of existence. In undertaking any of these possibilities, however, something is always necessarily left out (SZ 285). Consider this example: I have the possibility of taking vacation trips; no one else can really, as it were, go on vacation for me (if

somebody else goes, it is always *instead* of me). Nor can I go on vacation (in the sense intended here) "in general" (*überhaupt*). I have to decide where to go on vacation, and in so deciding, I rule out or relinquish certain possibilities. Finally, when I decide on a particular vacation, I become subject to a further set of requirements regarding, for example, what sort of clothes to bring, what sort of currency can be used, etc. What Heidegger calls "guilt" just is the human condition: we have to live our own lives, and doing so means that we are subject to a range of more or less specific claims of a broadly normative nature.

Of course, as Heidegger is well aware, the fact that things are expected of a person will hardly come as news. Why do we need the call of conscience? Part of the answer given here in §58 concerns the manner in which we typically get on with the ineluctable business of life, i.e., we treat it *as a business*. The "anyone," the generic identities and attendant expectations that we usually take up, "knows only the satisfying of manipulable rules and public norms and the failure to satisfy them. It reckons up infractions of them and tries to balance them off" (SZ 288). Life is treated as though it were an item on a schedule of tasks, rather than as a unique, unrepeatable, possibility. Responding to the call, then, involves taking life up in a way that Heidegger eventually, in §60, labels resoluteness.

Heidegger explains how resoluteness is basically a modified way of living out or inhabiting a network of AFFORDANCES anchored in a "FOR-THE-SAKE-OF-WHICH" (i.e., of BEING-IN-THE-WORLD) (SZ 297). Recalling the early Christian call to live "in the world" while simultaneously not "belonging to it," Heidegger stresses how resoluteness does not involve withdrawal or contemplative detachment (SZ 298). On the contrary, as he had already discussed in the 1924 lecture on *prohairesis* in Aristotle, in resoluteness Dasein is lucidly keyed into the "situation" (*Situation*), a specific domain of practical possibilities with its own normative texture (SZ 299–300). Furthermore, as a way in which Dasein has a *self*, resoluteness is a kind of commitment that organizes or governs the way in which the "situation" appears. To borrow an example from the Dennett–Frankfurt debate on free will, one can see what Heidegger is trying to articulate by considering how it might have gone for Luther at the Diet of Worms in 1521. Famously, when asked to recant his views, Luther responded, "Here I stand, I can do no other." His commitment to being a faithful interpreter of the New Testament brought into focus for him the theological underpinnings of a practice that, also in view of this commitment, seemed like an abuse. This identity-shaping self-understanding (what Heidegger calls a "for-the-sake-of-which") meant that certain features of the situation Luther was in were more critical than others, and thus guided his actions.

Following the introduction of the term resoluteness, Heidegger takes up, in Division II, chapter 3, the task of linking what he has just uncovered with his earlier discussions of authentic *being toward* DEATH (*Sein zum Tode*) or *anticipation*. The key move comes in §61, where Heidegger argues that resoluteness is not fully "enacted" or "actualized" unless Dasein "projects itself not upon any random possibilities which just lie closest, but upon that uttermost possibility which lies ahead of every factical ability-to-be of Dasein" (SZ 301). As Heidegger tries to show in §62, actively understanding oneself in terms of "guilt" is "authentically accomplished" only when the constant nature of this feature of Dasein is transparent or obvious (SZ 305). Only *being toward death*, however, fully discloses this "nullity" (SZ 306). In its fully realized state, resoluteness becomes "anticipating resoluteness" (*vorlaufende Entschlossenheit*).

The dense discussion in Division II, chapter 3, is ultimately meant to carry the project of fundamental ONTOLOGY to its deepest level by furnishing a "primordial" experience of

TEMPORALITY, which is the deep structure of CARE (see, e.g., SZ 304). However, also in §62, Heidegger provides some more focused comments on resoluteness as such. The sort of commitment involved does not require that one "become rigid toward the situation" (SZ 307). Instead, in a way that reflects something of the Aristotelian pedigree of the term, resoluteness involves an "openness" to the "current factical possibility" (SZ 307–08). Resoluteness "springs from a sober understanding of what are factically the basic possibilities for Dasein" (SZ 311). In part, this means that "Dasein becomes free from the entertaining 'incidentals' with which busy curiosity here provides itself" (SZ 311).

The meaning of resoluteness is clarified yet further in Division II, chapter 5, where Heidegger takes up the topic of Dasein's "historicality" (*Geschichtlichkeit*). Already in §60, Heidegger makes the observation that "To present the factical existentiell possibilities in their chief features and interconnections, and to interpret them according to their existential structure, falls among the tasks of a thematic existential anthropology" (SZ 301), i.e., not among the tasks of fundamental ontology. At the same time, Heidegger's comment here anticipates the reaction of many readers of *Being and Time*, who find the formal way in which resoluteness is explicated to be frustratingly empty. While Heidegger does not engage in the task of "a thematic existential anthropology," either in *Being and Time* or anywhere else in his vast corpus, he does shed further light on the structure of the phenomenon, particularly in §74. Once again, Heidegger makes it clear that the project in *Being and Time* does not include laying out just what it is that a particular Dasein might resolve in a particular case. What he does do, however, is to clarify *whence* it is that the possibilities upon which one "resolves" are drawn (SZ 383). Invoking the "THROWNNESS" of Dasein, which had been examined in detail earlier in the work, Heidegger describes how the possibilities in question derive "out of the heritage" (*aus dem Erbe*) within which each Dasein always already finds itself embedded (SZ 383). Of course, as Heidegger observes, resoluteness requires more than simply receiving some possibility of existence from one's cultural heritage. Instead, resoluteness means that Dasein "frees up" (*überliefert*) a possibility that is simultaneously "inherited" (*ererbten*) and "chosen" (*gewählten*, SZ 384).[1] Resoluteness involves "unlocking" a past possibility that has become a routine part of the public intelligibility of the "anyone."

Heidegger goes on to introduce a new term to capture the full significance of resoluteness, namely "fate" (*Schicksal*, SZ 384). In doing so, Heidegger is not invoking *fatalism* in the traditional sense; as he observes, "fate" in his sense "does not first arise from the clashing together of events and circumstances" (SZ 384). Instead, he is calling attention to the momentousness of the "resolve" involved in freeing up a possibility for oneself. To return to the earlier example, we can well imagine Luther regarding his calling as a biblical theologian, and the requirements that this laid on him in the concrete circumstances of the Diet of Worms, as his "fate" or "DESTINY." While Heidegger stresses the "whence" of the possibilities that are freed up by resoluteness, he does not hold that the latter requires explicit historical sensibility (SZ 385). Instead, in resoluteness, Dasein has its history in an altogether different sense, in that "it chooses its hero for itself" (SZ 385), and thus attains a cohesive, unifying self-understanding. As Heidegger puts it here, resoluteness "liberates one for struggling imitation [*kämpfende*

---

[1] Macquarrie and Robinson translate *überliefern* as "hand down," and *sichüberliefern* as "hand down to oneself." My rendering here reflects a suggestion found in Sheehan and Painter 1999. For a fuller discussion of this point in the context of resoluteness, see Crowe 2006, 189–90.

Nachfolge] and loyalty" of and toward the possibility that *Dasein* has taken up (SZ 385). Here in §74, Heidegger also recalls the lack of rigidity that he had highlighted in §62: "the repetition of the possible is neither a bringing back of the 'past,' nor a binding of the 'present' back to something that is 'outmoded' [*überholt*]" (SZ 385–86). That past possibility that Dasein takes up in resoluteness is not valuable *because it is from the past*; what matters is how commitment to this possibility sharpens one's sense of what is at stake *in the present situation* (SZ 386).

3 LATER DISCUSSIONS

As noted previously, Heidegger's explicit discussions of resoluteness (and cognate terms) become briefer and less frequent in the years following the publication of *Being and Time*; yet the term by no means drops out. Heidegger's later discussions can be divided roughly into three categories: passages that elaborate on the meaning of the term and its cognates in a manner continuous with earlier discussions; passages that involve taking stock of earlier discussions or their apparent reception, which also include revisions of the basic concepts involved; and, finally, passages dating from Heidegger's Rectorate that contain explicitly political appropriations of resoluteness and its cognates.

In his lecture course for the winter of 1929–30, Heidegger revisits resoluteness within the context of an analysis of different forms of boredom. Here, he observes that resoluteness is opposed to a kind of "emptiness" that comes from being "casual" (*lässig*), from "abandoning ourselves to whatever there is going on" and "leaving ourselves behind [*Sichzurücklassen*]: ourselves, namely, our authentic [*eigentliche*] self" (GA29/30:180). A more profound state of boredom, however, in which entities as a whole "refuse" themselves, harbors the possibility of a kind of liberating disclosure of Dasein's basic ontological structure in a way that recalls the function of the call of conscience in *Being and Time* (GA29/30:222–23). This liberating disclosure, like the call of conscience, calls forth Dasein as "resolved towards itself [*zu sich selbst entschließt*], i.e., disclosed for itself as Da-sein" (GA29/30:223). As in *Being and Time*, Heidegger here stresses the way in which resoluteness involves a focused commitment that sharpens one's sense of what is important in the present context of action (GA29/30:223–24).

Resoluteness also factors importantly into a later text based on lectures on Nietzsche delivered between 1936 and 1939, particularly in a section dedicated to explicating Nietzsche's conception of the "will as will to power" (GA6.1:33–40/N1 37–43). Heidegger's account echoes the earlier introduction of resoluteness as a translation of Aristotle's *prohairesis*, itself sometimes rendered as "will" or "volition" in English (e.g., GA6.1:37–38/N1 40–41). Resoluteness is that whereby one "comes to grips" (*den setzenden Ausgriff hat*) with what is willed (GA6.1:38/N1 41). As in *Being and Time*, an essential moment of resoluteness involves a sensitivity to the normative texture of the context of action (GA6.1:38/N1 41). Heidegger's winter 1942–43 lectures on Parmenides also incorporate the term resoluteness in a manner that simultaneously harks back to the Aristotle lectures of the 1920s and reflects the changing emphases of his thinking during this period. Here, Heidegger renders the Greek *arête* (usually translated as "virtue" or "excellence") as resoluteness (GA54:109, 111–12). A final interesting discussion, found in the protocol of a 1957 seminar on Hegel, links resoluteness with the activity of philosophizing (GA86:856–57; cf. "On the Essence of Truth," §8).

While passages such as these develop an understanding of resoluteness that is importantly continuous with the usage of *Being and Time*, other passages find Heidegger revisiting the

relevant ideas from a changed perspective and raising questions for common or more obvious interpretations. For example, in "The Origin of the Work of Art," referring back to *Being and Time*, Heidegger explains resoluteness as Dasein's "opening up from out of its captivity by entities into the openness of being," somewhat puzzlingly warning against the connotations of "decisive action" that normally attach to resoluteness and its cognates. In §43 of *Beiträge zur Philosophie*, Heidegger likewise notes how difficult it is to use words like resolution (*Entschluß*) and resoluteness (*Entschlossenheit*) without calling to mind subjective acts and processes (GA65:87). He further warns of the "danger" of "misreading" *Being and Time* in an "existentiell-anthropological" manner (GA65:87–88; cf. GA65:283–84). Yet, as if to illustrate this very danger, Heidegger goes on to talk about "questioning the essence of truth" as "resoluteness" for "the most extreme REFLECTION [*Besinnung*]" (GA65:387–98). Comments on the potential for misreading *Being and Time* can also be found in the related text entitled *Besinnung* (GA66:144–45, 323–24). It is worth pointing out, however, that comments in *Being and Time* itself already anticipate this worry about the potential for reading resoluteness and related terms in an overly subjectivistic way (SZ 278).

The final category of texts after *Being and Time* consists of explicitly *political* appropriations of the language of resoluteness within the context of Heidegger's tenure as Rector in Freiburg (1933–34). In lectures from the winter of 1933–34, Heidegger argues that talk of the National Socialist "revolution" in the university is overblown, since both the students and the larger society are engaged in a kind of organized self-deception that betrays a lack of resoluteness (GA38:75–77/64–66). In an address to matriculating students in May 1933, Heidegger argues that genuine "academic freedom" lies in resoluteness "for collective spiritual [*geistigen*] action for the German fate" (GA16:96). His infamous inaugural speech, "The Self-Assertion of the German University," deploys the language of resoluteness at key points in the argument (GA16:112–13/HR 113). Similar comments can be found in other occasional pieces from this period (GA16:239/HC 54; GA16:300). Given the conceptual proximity between the ideas expressed here and the discussions in *Being and Time*, it becomes particularly important to understand the political context and political resonances of Heidegger's chief published work.

Benjamin Crowe

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Being-resolute GA18:144–48
Resoluteness and fate SZ 384–86
Resoluteness and Greek philosophy GA6.1:37–38/N1 40–41; GA18:144–48; GA54:109, 111–12
Resoluteness and heritage SZ 383–84
Resoluteness and situation SZ 297–300, 307–08, 311; GA6.1:38/N1 41; GA29/30:223–24

FURTHER READING

Blattner 2013, Crowe 2001, Crowe 2006, Crowell 2001b, Crowell 2007, Dahlstrom 2001, Guignon 2006, Jonas 1963, Löwith 1995

RESOLUTION (*AUSTRAG*). SEE DISPOSITION.

RESONANCE (*SCHWINGUNG*). SEE OSCILLATION.

176.
RESONATING (*ANKLANG*)

Resonating is a form of indirect GIVENNESS of BEING or, in Heidegger's terminology of the 1930s and 1940s, of BEYNG. More precisely, it is not beyng that is experienced in the resonating, but rather the lack of beyng. This specific form of negativity comes forth as forgetfulness and ABANDONMENT OF BEING (or by beyng). Like in a photographic negative, the resonating of beyng presents the exact reverse of beyng which, in its very withdrawal from a manifest presence, becomes manifest as lacking within that very presence. Like the lost key one is searching for, the "sounding" at issue here is the presence of an absence, the "resonating of beyng in its refusal" to appear (GA65:9). Yet differently than the key, which is an absent object, what resonates in its refusal to appear is the thoroughly eventful character of beyng.

Resonating translates the German *Anklang*, a term without antecedent in philosophical language and coined terminologically by Heidegger mainly in *Contributions to Philosophy* (GA65:84–129). In common speech, the term primarily signifies that some meaning is not expressed directly, but only in an allusive manner. Literally *Anklang* means that a sound does not become distinctly audible, but only has an implicit and somehow lateral acoustic presence – a resonance – by means of some other sound, which, in contrast, is indeed audible in a distinct way. Thus *Anklang* should not be rendered by "echo" (cf. Parvis Emad's translation of *Contributions to Philosophy*), for which Heidegger reserves its German cognate *Widerhall* (cf. GA65:497; later the Greek term of *homologein*; cf. GA7:220–21/EGT 66), a term with very different metaphorical (and thus conceptual) implications. Whereas the metaphorical content of "echo" marks a repetition of a formerly present sound, "resonating" takes place only within the presence of something from which it differs, in the same way an ironical allusion differs from what is explicitly said (often intending the opposite meaning), or a connotation differs from the denotation of a proper meaning to which it is rather loosely linked.

This is the sense that Heidegger attributes to the concept of "resonating" within the systematic structure of what he calls the "conjuncture of inceptional thinking" (GA65:59). Note, however, that Heidegger employs much effort to show that he is neither producing *concepts* nor that such non-conceptual notions or expressions (e.g., "resonating," "interplay," "leap," etc.), can be understood within the framework of a traditional philosophical *system* like German Idealism (cf. GA65:5; GA42:42–53). Be that as it may, within the composition of the *Contributions* "The Resonating" (GA65:84–129) functions as the first of six moments of the conjuncture of inceptional thinking of beyng, followed by "The Interplay," "The Leap," "The Grounding," "The Future Ones," and "The Last God" (note that the opening section §I "The Prospect" and the concluding §VIII "Beyng" are not moments of the conjuncture of beyng). More precisely, in the composition of *Contributions* "The Resonating" has the heuristic function of fostering an attentiveness for the possibility of another beginning of thinking, which differs from the first beginning Heidegger identifies with ancient Greek philosophy, namely Parmenides, Plato, and Aristotle and their engagement with a specific history of being as

presence. Turning away from this, the resonating is meant to let sound a radically altered experience of beyng leading to a state of interplay, from which a leap into another thinking and a different grounding of future human existence and religiosity shall become possible. Heidegger formulates this revolutionary program in statements like the following: "Through a disclosure of the abandonment by being, the resonating of beyng seeks to bring back beyng in its full essential occurrence as event. That bringing back will happen only if, through the grounding of Da-sein, entities are placed back into beyng as opened up in the leap" (GA65:116).

This program of another beginning takes its departure from the present historical situation – Heidegger's own reality of the 1930s, characterized, for him, by the forgottenness of beyng, that is, NIHILISM (GA65:138–41), and the corresponding attunements of "shock" (a better translation would perhaps be "horror") and "diffidence" (GA65:107). These are closely linked to what Heidegger calls "MACHINATION" (GA65:126–28) and, later, to TECHNOLOGY (*Technik*) and INVENTORY (*Ge-Stell*). Heidegger holds that in and through machination, beyng itself is veiled in such a way that the problematic character – the "plight" (*Not*) – of such containment of beyng remains unnoticed. This "plight of the lack of a sense of plight" (*Not der Notlosigkeit*), "where everything is held to be calculable" (GA65:107, 125), is enforced by a complex and increasingly powerful system of interrelated metaphysical, technological, cultural, and scientific deployments resulting from (and leading to an even more fundamental) general misunderstanding of what being really is. Specifically, beyng becomes the object of quantification and calculation of nature, of political mobilization of the masses, of technological transformation both of human existence and the world in which we live, of the cultural industry, and of the enhancement of human possibilities on a gigantic scale. At the center of this misunderstanding, beyng is veiled by the apparently unquestionable ontological presupposition that beyng is nothing other than something objectively present and lacking in any further sense beyond the meaning provided by a total mathematization of the world. The "first law of machination" is thus: "that the more prescriptively machination unfolds … all the more obstinately and machinationally does it conceal itself as such … in modernity behind objectivity as the basic form of actuality and thus of beingness" (GA65:127). What is not objectively present is reduced to absence and can only appear, if at all, laterally to such presence, that is, through a resonating which resounds somehow silently in a space of Western rationality characterized by a general "antipathy toward the questionworthiness of beyng" (GA65:127). Heidegger's ontology of the resonance of beyng is intended as a revolutionary attack on precisely this neglect of "beyng in its full essential occurrence as event," that is: an attack against a cold world in which everything is reduced to calculation.

With the publication of the BLACK NOTEBOOKS, it has become clear that Heidegger links his sharp analysis of modernity as essentially driven by machination and objectification not only to philosophical discourse (e.g., from Plato to the Kantian position, according to which being would be the most empty predicate; cf. KrV A597/B626 – A601/B629; GA9:445–80/337–63), but also to meta-political implications informed by a violently anti-Semitic discourse. For instance, Heidegger states that: "One of the hidden figures of the GIGANTIC" – that is, for Heidegger: one central figure of machination – "and perhaps the most ancient is the pertinacious dexterity for calculation … by which the worldlessness of Judaism is grounded" (GA95:97). By this supposed "worldlessness," Heidegger suggests that "the Jews" (GA96:56) are endowed with an only "empty rationality" (GA96:46) and a "special capacity to calculate" (GA96:56), by means of which they do not acquire any more understanding of beyng than, say,

a stone – that is, obviously none – and thus are unable to hear and to respond to the resonance of beyng in order to answer this call by another "grounding of the truth of beyng" (GA96:47). The "self-annihilation" of "machination" (GA97:18), which Heidegger sees in World War II, also comprises the Holocaust, by which "the Jews" (*die Judenschaft*) became – indeed, this is Heidegger's most cynical reversal of the historical facts – subject to the "self-annihilation in history" (GA97:20).

David Espinet

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Resonating and machination/nihilism GA65:119–38; GA68:255; GA69:202; GA76:341; GA45:199–200
Resonating and metaphysics (of presence) GA45:1, 98, 100, 205, 218
Resonating and the event/beginning GA65:310, 395–98, 412, 445; GA66:47; GA67:99; GA69:131; GA71:74–79
Resonating and poetry/listening GA12:232/OWL 113; GA53:13, 61, 63, 69, 126, 156; GA55:245; GA75:63–71; GA76:28
Resonating and (meta-)politics GA97:10, 52, 298, 456–57

FURTHER READING

Espinet 2016, 146–50, Ruin 2005a, Polt 1999, 140–52

RESPOND (*ENTSPRECHEN*). SEE CORRESPONDENCE.

RESPONSIBILITY (*SCHULD*). SEE GUILT.

177.
RESTRAINT (*VERHALTENHEIT*)

Restraint is a fundamental attunement that involves a self-restraint and reserve in letting the human being release its sense of control. But it also involves the creative sense of preparing humans for being's refusal and way of withholding/concealing itself, attuning them to "the concealed history of the great stillness" (GA65:34–35). This *ethos* of restraint is, then, less one of possession and ownership than it is one of abandonment in attuning to the absential dimension of being: Heidegger understands "restraint as openness for the reticent nearness of the essential occurrence of beyng."

In an *ethos*, we are held open (*aufgehalten*) to the withholding (*Vorenthalt*) event of being even as we attune ourselves to a restraint (*Verhaltenheit*) marked by forbearance (*Enthaltung*) that restrains itself (*sich enthält*). Language, as our proper *ethos*, thus becomes a deeply ethical concern for Heidegger in that it attunes us to being's absential dimension, its way of holding itself back, concealing itself in ways that do not conform to the language of presence. Heidegger challenges us to stir ourselves from the slumbers of quotidian habit and protocol, to heed the appeal of authentic dwelling so that we might hold ourselves ready for being held in the sway of being's essential occurrence. In the way we abide in language (*Sprache*), we either hold ourselves open to this call or we remain passive bystanders. Despite the fact that "we only rarely attend to the appeal [*Zuspruch*] of being," Heidegger still will claim that "the correspondence [*Entsprechung*] to the being of entities does indeed constantly remain our sojourn [*Aufenthalt*]" (GA11:20/WP 74–75). In Heidegger's late work it is Hölderlin's poetizing that calls us to an authentic *ethos* that corresponds to the ethicality of being, of being's own way of appropriating us to the great *Weltspiel* ("world-play," "play of the world") that happens in the "mirror-play of the fourfold of heaven and earth, mortals and gods" (GA12:202/OWL 106; GA11:121/QCT 45). This becomes for Heidegger a kind of measure-taking of the poetic dimension that keeps all components of the fourfold in a measured relation. But what calls forth measuring here is something that preoccupied Heidegger as far back as 1923: "precisely this is the highest task: to gain an authentic sojourn [*Aufenthalt*] and not just any kind whatsoever" (GA63:109).

Perhaps nowhere does Heidegger express this relation of *ethos*, sojourn, and authentic dwelling as powerfully as in the "Letter on 'Humanism.'" Already in his *Contributions to Philosophy* (1936–38, GA65), Heidegger underscored the need for a turning in Dasein's fundamental comportment (*Haltung*) toward entities, one that brings together two equiprimordial attunements: shock and diffidence. Dasein is shocked that entities *are* and diffident in the face of being's power to open itself up as an event of withdrawal. Shock and awe find their proper relation in the grounding attunement of restraint, an attunement that holds us back from unfettered control and volitional dominion, disposing us toward the absential play of being in and as withdrawal (*Entzug*) and withholding (*Vorenthalt*). As Heidegger explains, "restraint is *the basic disposition of the relation to beyng* and in it the concealment of the essence of being becomes what is most worthy of questioning" (GA45:2). This fundamental attunement that Heidegger characterizes as "the basic disposition *of . . . futural* philosophy" also serves as the preparatory

attunement for the return of the gods to the earth in a Hölderlinian festival celebrating the event of being. That is, if *thaumazein* or wonder served as the grounding attunement of the first INCEPTION, then, Heidegger claims, restraint will serve as "the basic disposition of thinking in the other inception" (GA65:14).

In the post-war era, Heidegger will think restraint as the stance (*Haltung*) of letting things be and of letting ourselves be released from the volitional drive to fashion, devise, and plan the world we inhabit. This stance of RELEASEMENT (*Gelassenheit*) involves restraint – but it also allows "us to keep ourselves open [*uns offen halten*] for the meaning that lies concealed in the technological world: *the openness to the mystery*" (GA16:528–29/DT 55; see TECHNOLOGY). For Heidegger the genuine task of human dwelling thus becomes one of resisting the all-pervasive allures of calculative thinking, while attempting to cultivate a rooted sense for meditative REFLECTION. This is what is "most proper" to the human being. Hence, Heidegger claims, "what matters is to keep ourselves wakeful for reflective thinking [*das Nachdenken wach zu halten*]."

The "Letter on 'Humanism'" thinks "restraint" (*Verhaltenheit*), this new stance (*Haltung*) toward entities, in terms of the paronomastic play of language in its relation to a stop or stability (*Halt*), comportment (*Verhalten*), relationship (*Verhältnis*), a withdrawal (*Vorenthalt*), and an abode or sojourn (*Aufenthalt*). Moreover, it does so by situating such a comportment against Hölderlin's understanding of modernity as an age in default, a destitute time between the departure of the gods and their awaited coming again in a time that cannot be calculated or secured through human contrivance. In the "Letter," Heidegger will rethink the "ethical" in a new and radical sense that breaks with the metaphysical tradition of ethics. If traditional ethics begins with the subject as an autonomous agent who renders decisions by virtue of its volitional power, Heidegger's *ethos* presupposes our historical belonging to a world that is not of our own making, but one in which we find ourselves as thrown entities and not as masters of our domain. Here *ethos* will be understood as our abode, our sojourn (*Aufenthalt*) upon the earth that is less a form of "character" than it is a movement within which we destinally dwell, what Hölderlin in "The Rhine" names "the bounds which GOD at birth assigned to us for our term and site (*Aufenthalt*)" (lines 127–29). In our sojourn between birth and death our genuine sojourn lies in dwelling in nearness to the gods. Yet this sojourn (*Aufenthalt*) presupposes a stance (*Haltung*) of restraint (*Verhaltenheit*), an attunement to being's withdrawal (*Vorenthalt*), as our fundamental way of being in the world amidst entities.

Charles Bambach

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA35:86–87; GA39:275; GA65:14–17, 33–36, 405; GA67:86; GA77:144

RETRIEVE (*WIEDERHOLUNG*). SEE REPETITION.

REVERSAL (*KEHRE*). SEE TURN.

178.
RIFT (*RIß*)

T HE RIFT IS a "design" that unifies the strife between WORLD and EARTH and is manifest through the figure (*Gestalt*) of a work of ART. Heidegger's analysis of the rift (*Riß*), in turn, plays an important role in his account of what is required in order for TRUTH to happen in art and for a work to be created.

Heidegger discusses the notion of "rift" in "The Origin of the Work of Art" in the context of discussing the strife between world and earth. In this essay, he characterizes a world as what belongs to a historical PEOPLE, e.g., the world of ancient Greece or the Middle Ages, and he claims that it is what "opens" or "clears" the "relations and paths" for that people, which give their lives meaning and shape their destiny (GA5:28/21). As he makes this point, "the world is the self-opening openness of the broad paths of simple and essential decisions in the destiny of a historical people" (GA5:35/26). By contrast, Heidegger maintains that the earth is not dependent upon us, but rather is something that arises out of itself. Indeed, he claims that it is something that is closed off to human understanding: "it shows itself only when it remains undisclosed and unexplained. Earth shatters every attempt to penetrate it" (GA5:34/25). For this reason, he describes earth as something that is "self-closing" and "self-secluding" (GA5:35/ 26, 34/25).

Given that world is what opens up a space of human meaning and earth is what closes itself off from us, Heidegger claims that the two are "essentially different"; however, he also insists that world and earth are "never separated from one another" because "World is grounded on earth, and earth rises up through world" (GA5:35/26). In cashing out the relationship between the two, he argues that they do not relate to one another in the "empty unity of opposites unconcerned with one another"; instead, they relate to one another as two opponents in a fight (GA5:35/26). Insofar as world and earth are thus locked in a struggle, he designates the relationship between the two as one of "strife" (GA5:35/26).

Heidegger introduces the term "rift" in order to clarify what this strife involves. Rift carries the connotation of a "split" between two things; however, Heidegger claims that the rift between world and earth cannot be understood as a "tear" or "rupture" between the two. Instead, drawing on related terms like *Grundriß, Aufriß, Umriß* (which are translated as "fundamental design," "sketch," and "outline," respectively), he maintains that the rift between world and earth is a "design" that binds the two together (GA5:51/ 38). In his words,

> The rift [*Riß*] carries the contestants into the source of their unity, their common ground. It is the fundamental design [*Grundriß*]. It is the outline sketch [*Auf-riß*]. . . . This design [*Riß*] does not allow the contestants to break apart. It brings the contest . . . into a shared outline [*Umriß*]. (GA5:51/38)

The *Riß* between world and earth is thus both a rift and a design that unifies them in their strife.

Furthermore, Heidegger asserts that the rift is something that is "fixed in place" by means of the "figure" (*Gestalt*) of a work of art (GA5:51/38). As he says in the context of discussing Dürer's famous remark that "art is found in nature; whoever can wrest [*reißen*] her has it," "wrest [*reißen*] means here, to bring forth the rift and to seize [*reißen*] it with drawing pen and drawing board" (or presumably whatever one's preferred medium is) (GA5:58/43). According to Heidegger, the rift is something that has to be brought forth in a work of art because this is what world and earth demand: whereas world requires that the rift is something that has to be "set forth into the open" through some existing being, earth requires that it "set itself back into the pull of the weight of the stone, into the dumb hardness of the wood, into the dark glow of colors" (GA5:51/38). On his account, it is the figure of the work of art that accomplishes both of these things: it allows the rift to be set into the earth, while at the same time opening it up to us.

One of the reasons Heidegger emphasizes the idea that the rift between world and earth is fixed in place in the figure of the work of art is because he sees it as playing a pivotal role in the happening of truth, which is essential for art. According to Heidegger, truth happens "as the ur-strife between CLEARING and concealment" and "as the contesting of the strife between world and earth" (GA5:42/32, 45/33). However, he claims that in order for this happening to take place,

> the openness of this OPEN, i.e., truth, can only be what it is, namely this open, when and as long as it establishes itself in its open. In this open, therefore there must be a being in which the openness takes its stand and achieves constancy. (GA5:48/36)

Given that the rift between world and earth is fixed into place in the figure of a work of art, Heidegger identifies the work of art as a being in which truth establishes itself. Hence his claim that, "The structured rift [*Riß*] is the jointure of the shining of truth" (GA5:51/38).

Heidegger, in turn, uses this analysis of the relationship between rift, truth, and figure to elucidate the "created" nature of a work of art. Though the createdness of a work of art is usually analyzed just in terms of the relationship between an artist and her work, Heidegger says that "the createdness of the work means: the fixing in place of truth in the figure. Figure is the fitting structure [*Gefüge*] of the rift in its self-establishment" (GA5:51/38; see FITTINGNESS). For Heidegger, creation is thus a process that involves the "self-establishment" of the rift in the figure of the work. For this reason, although he acknowledges that the artist is required for a work to become actual, he claims that "the essence of creation is determined by the essence of the work" (GA5:47/35).

Samantha Matherne

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA5:51–53/38–40, 58/43, 60/45, 72/54/; GA12:24–29/PLT 201–06; GA12:60/OWL 183, 69/190, 185/90, 240/121

RISING (*AUFGANG*). SEE EMERGENCE.

S

179.
SCIENCE (*WISSENSCHAFT*)

Heidegger uses "science" (*Wissenschaft*) broadly to include any formalized discipline of knowledge. When Heidegger discusses *Wissenschaft*, he usually means natural science, especially physics, though on occasion he intends theology, philology, archaeology, art history, or history,[1] and in GA29/30, biology. Much as Anglophones distinguish STEM disciplines (science, technology, engineering, and mathematics) from HASS (humanities, arts, and social sciences), natural sciences (*Naturwissenschaften*) are distinct from *Geisteswissenschaften* (literally, sciences of spirit) in German. *Geisteswissenschaften* was coined in 1849 to translate Mill's "moral sciences,"[2] the sciences of the thoughts, feelings, and actions of human beings, including the study of the laws of mind, human nature, society, political economy, and history (see Mill 1900, 554). Heidegger does not always mean what contemporary Anglophones understand by "science," i.e., STEM disciplines.

The distinction between *Natur-* and *Geisteswissenschaften* is increasingly crucial in his thinking, as he develops throughout his work a deep concern to distinguish the representational thinking of physics from a different kind of knowledge at work in the discipline of history. For Heidegger, physics is ontologically and epistemologically paradigmatic in the modern age; thus in 1938, *Wissenschaft* (which he refers back to Galileo and Bacon) provides the interpretation of TRUTH that he assesses to critique MODERNITY. Only understanding history, however, makes evident the necessity for a new beginning or INCEPTION. Such another beginning is called for because the HISTORY of the West is essentially for Heidegger the history of interpretations of nature (*phusis*),[3] and it culminates in global destruction (GA6.2:358/N4 248).

I *WISSENSCHAFT* AS PHYSICS: THE MATHEMATICAL PROJECTION OF NATURE

In 1912, Heidegger poses the philosophical problem of realism, given that "dazzling results" have led to "healthy realism" in scientific (*naturwissenschaftliche*) praxis (GA1:3/BH 21). In 1917, he uses Galileo's physics as paradigmatic of science in order to argue that history also is scientific. In §69 of *Being and Time* – when he says he is now returning to the phenomenological method as promised in §7, so non-trivially – he discusses the theoretical attitude as the mathematical understanding of nature, typical of physics. In *Die Frage nach dem Ding* (GA41), his discussion of *Wissenschaft* centers on the physics of Aristotle, Galileo, and Newton. In "Age of the World Picture," he quotes Planck, and in the technology essay, Bacon and Heisenberg (GA7:24/QCT 23). *Wissenschaft*, for Heidegger, is most often physics.

In the technology essay, he argues further that the ESSENCE of TECHNOLOGY (*Ge-Stell*), that reveals nature as a STANDING RESERVE (*Bestand*) to be stock-piled and reckoned, is already

---

[1] See esp. GA25:25; GA65:142 and §76.
[2] Gadamer notes that the word was made popular by translators of Mill's *Logic* (Gadamer 2004, 3).
[3] As he explains in reading Aristotle's *Physics* in "*On the Essence and Concept of Phusis in Aristotle's Physics B, 1*" (GA9).

present in the scientific projection of nature as "a coherence of forces calculable in advance" (GA7:22/QCT 21). Accordingly, "modern physics is the herald of the INVENTORY" (*Ge-stells*) (GA7:23/QCT 22; see also SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT(ION)ING), which in turn realizes "the organized global conquest of the earth" (GA6.2:358/N4 248). Thus he argues shortly before the technology essay that "Modern science is grounded in the essence [*Wesen*] of technology" (GA8:140/135). *Wissenschaft* is accordingly not just one concept amongst many for Heidegger, but the concept that determines the modern experience of technology (*Technik*) in the West (*das Abendland*).

The projective nature of *Wissenschaft* was apparent to Heidegger in his 1917 argument that physics differs from history because each projects the time-concept differently. In both SZ and GA41, *Wissenschaft* is "the mathematical projection of nature" (SZ §69; GA41:89/WT 88 and *passim*). In GA41, "mathematical" is explained as that which is already known and brought to experience, i.e., what is projected. Accordingly, in the 1950s, he does not take quantum physics – though he understands the novelty of its statistical mechanics (GA7:54/QCT 172–73) – to be significantly different from Newtonian physics. In both, "nature has in advance to set itself in place for the entrapping securing that science, as theory, accomplishes" (GA7:54/QCT 172–73), so that "nature reports itself in some way or other that is identifiable through calculation and ... orderable as a system of information" (GA7:24/QCT 23). Nature is accordingly objectified in science through mathematical projection. Objectivity is the central concept of the representational thinking of the sciences in Heidegger's analysis. Thus he argues famously that "science does not think [*denkt nicht*]" (GA8:9/8 and *passim*).

WISSENSCHAFT AND HISTORY

Heidegger also says that "most thought-provoking of all is that we are still not thinking" (GA8:6/4 and *passim*). His claim is not just that science does not think, but that the epistemological dominance in modernity of the representational thinking of the sciences precludes other ways of thinking. His objection is not to the sciences, but to scientism, i.e., the overblown significance of the sciences that pervades modern understanding of what counts as knowledge.

This is an insight that emerges in Heidegger's later work. In the early days, he is less critical of science. In 1917, he argues that history is a science (GA1:418/BH 63). By 1927, philosophy itself is inherently scientific (GA24:15–19/11–15) and, moreover, is the science of being [*Wissenschaft vom Sein*] that grounds the regional ontologies of the sciences. By the late 1930s, however, he is bemoaning the spread of scientific objectivity into other disciplines, in particular, history.

In §76 of the *Beiträge*, he observes that scientific ways of thinking have permeated other disciplines, and he distinguishes the journalistic collecting of facts, which he calls historical science, from the discipline of history, which takes an interpretive stance toward facts and endows them with meaning. The trouble with a scientistic view of history is that the claim to objectivity in the study of history will deny any perspectival stance. If history is scientistic, critical understanding of the limit of science in modernity is impossible (GA65:151–55). That is, history as science cannot reveal the historical significance of the sciences.

Heidegger argued in SZ that Dasein is essentially an inquirer (SZ 7). In 1929, he argues that the sciences stand at the heart of the university (GA9:103/82), and in 1938 that science is the issue from which modernity can be understood (GA5:76/QCT 117). Science is thus the modern realization of the human urge for knowledge. The sciences do not simply provide descriptions of the real, but establish knowledge in situated paradigms that inform human experience. Science is accordingly much more than a body of objective theory. It is an event (*Ereignis*), a social force and human destiny.

In *Besinnung*, Heidegger accordingly argues that "Overcoming history [*Historie*] must be a freeing of history [*Geschichte*] from the circle of objectification by history [*Historie*]" (GA66:184). Theory is not essentially producing (*poiêsis*) or taking-a-stance (*praxis*), understood in modernity as a kind of putting things in place, but rather, theory "lets entities presence in themselves, that is, from out of the *archê* that lies within them" (GA66:390). Yet this is not an insight that can be gleaned from within the sciences themselves.

In 1937, Heidegger poses the question, what is worth knowing? He argues that "*No science can know by itself about its own fulfillment as knowledge.*"[4] The method (*Vorgehen*) of physics says nothing about physics, just as mathematics can say nothing about the essence or methods (*Methode*) of mathematics. Geology cannot be investigated geologically, nor philology philologically. Thus Heidegger asks: which is preferable, researching hand grenades or fertilizers?[5] He understands explicitly that the sciences cannot be evaluated scientifically beyond their correctness. Their purpose is to understand their object, and their value for humankind cannot be answered in terms of the correctness of this understanding. Objectivity denies value judgments.

In 1938, he assesses science in terms of its ongoing activity and industriousness, its *Betriebcharakter* (GA5:84/QCT 138–39). Researchers travel to conferences, and collude with publishers to decide what gets published. Publishers do not necessarily understand "the needs of the public" (GA5:90/QCT 139) any better than scientists do through their technical expertise, but they collaborate in public confirmation of the "objectification of whatever is" (GA5:86/QCT 126) and the "certainty of representation" (GA5:80/QCT 127). The institutionalization of knowledge generates disciplinary solidarity concerning "the precedence of methodology over whatever is (nature and history), which at any given time becomes objective in research" (GA5:78/QCT 125). Humanities also become sciences precisely when objectivity becomes their epistemological standard. Yet ongoing activity "becomes mere busyness whenever, in the pursuit of its methodology, it no longer keeps itself open on the basis of an ever-new accomplishing of its projection-plan, but only leaves that plan behind itself as a given" (GA5:90/QCT 138), i.e., when self-critique is no longer possible.

In 1917, some twenty-one years earlier, Heidegger argued that the function of the time-concept in physics is to make measurement possible (GA1:423/BH 66). In history, it is to make possible a fixing of time, but also to give proper meaning to context (GA1:430/BH 70). History, Heidegger quotes from Redlich, becomes scientific (*wissenschaftlich*) through "validation of the sources" (GA1:429/BH 69; cf. GA5:82/QCT 122). Yet there is something qualitative and not just quantitative in the time-concept in history. Hidden in the 1917 essay lies a glimmering of the realization that history is fundamentally not a science. Only when Heidegger has come to terms with science as the mathematical projection of nature can he see that history must not be scientific if it is to counter the

---

[4] Heidegger 1991, 12.   [5] Heidegger 1991, 27.

tendency of the knowledge industry to take its project of objectivity for granted – as Heidegger himself did in the face of science's "dazzling results" (GA1:3/BH 21). Only when this modern essence of science is thought through do researchers and the sciences "offer themselves for the common good" (GA5:86/QCT 126), for only then can historical analysis contribute questions of the value of knowledge by assessing the sciences beyond their successful production of facts.

By the 1950s, Heidegger is thus arguing explicitly that science cannot question "the essence and essential origin of the manner of knowing which it cultivates" (GA8:37/33). He calls the sciences one-sided for just this reason, and diagnoses their one-sidedness as *das Unumgängliche*, that which cannot be gotten around (GA7:60/QCT 177). Scientists can only question their discipline, and science more broadly, by stepping outside technical practice. This analysis echoes the claim in SZ that the basic concepts of a science can "undergo a more or less radical revision" (SZ 9). But from the mid-1930s, such revision cuts much deeper for Heidegger than Kuhnian revolution. More than a shift in particular theoretical concepts and facts, Heidegger is calling for discussion of how the sciences constitute knowledge that might fulfill the public good.

Heidegger's early predilection for science has been displaced by the argument that historical reflection is necessary, and necessarily not scientific, because of its relation to time. He has then come full circle to the 1917 essay on projection of time. Yet he no longer works in the *Natur-/ Geisteswissenschaft* distinction insofar as history not only is not, but also should never be scientific – history is no longer *Wissenschaft* if *Wissenschaft* means science – if human being is ever to have a new beginning beyond the global conquest of the earth and its peoples by the essence of technology.

Thus Heidegger calls for REFLECTION (*Besinnung*) upon the sciences that is "calm, self-possessed surrender [RELEASEMENT, *Gelassenheit*] to that which is worthy of questioning" (GA7:63/QCT 180). Such reflection does not take place in the technical practice of science, but "every researcher and teacher of the sciences, every [one] pursuing a way through science, can move, as a thinking being, on various levels of reflection" (GA7:65/ QCT 181–82). As an epoch-defining event in human history, the sciences have, consistent with the infamous *Rektoratsrede*, an obligation to the people. Scientists are after all in the best position of all to evaluate their goals, and the value and limitations of their science.

The sciences are therefore not intrinsically or inherently destructive for Heidegger. Rather, it is uncritical acceptance of their role and function in determining modernity that is threatening. They are a historical project, and as such, their ontology and epistemology warrant delimitation. He thus calls for critical interrogation and evaluative assessment of the sciences, much as he argues for poetic assessment of technology in the technology essay.

Wissenschaft is accordingly a central word, concept, and issue in the Heideggerian corpus, and much richer than can be captured here. It is a driving and evolving issue in his thinking. Ultimately, when he seeks to describe a new beginning, he does not talk of *Wissen*, perhaps because it is irretrievable from its identification with *Wissenschaft* (science) as *Naturwissenschaft* (natural science). Rather, he names the alternative to the event of science that determines the modern epoch "thinking" (*Denken*) and "reflection" (*Besinnung*).

Trish Glazebrook

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Some of Heidegger's landmark works on science are:

1912: "The Problem of Reality in Modern Philosophy," GA1/BH
1916: "The Concept of Time in the Science of History," GA1/BH
1936: "Die Bedrohung der Wissenschaft," in *Zur philosophischen Aktualität Heideggers*, vol. 1: *Philosophie und Politik*, ed. D. Papenfuss and Otto Poeggeler (Frankfurt am Main: Vittorio Klostermann, 1991), 5–27
1938: "The Age of the World Picture," GA5/QCT
1954: "Science and Reflection," GA7/QCT

FURTHER READING

Glazebrook 2000, Glazebrook 2001, Glazebrook 2012, W.J. Richardson 1968, Rouse 1981

SECRET (*GEHEIMNIS*). SEE MYSTERY.

180.
SEEMING (*SCHEIN*)

Seeming or semblance is a privative modification of showing-itself. It is the pretension to be evident or manifest (*offenbar*) without actually being so. Seeming is, therefore, a severe source of deception. But its showing neither refers to something nor is it a mere symptom of something else. Rather, it is an immediate showing-itself that was covered up at some point in history and is now disguised by Dasein's falling. As a result, seeming refers to being and can be a starting point of its unveiling. Heidegger sees a concealed unity of seeming and being, so that truth and untruth are structurally interconnected and seeming belongs necessarily to the nature of human beings. Pure, unconcealed seeming is created in all art, including philosophy. Here, seeming itself becomes being by transfiguring what had become fixed before, thereby opening up new possibilities.

(1) Heidegger initially develops his conception of seeming within the framework of phenomenology. "That which shows itself in itself" (SZ 31) is the definition of a phenomenon which opens the possibility "for an entity to show itself as something which in itself it is not" (SZ 28). In unfavorable conditions, a rock might seem to be an animal without actually being it. Heidegger discriminates this "privative modification of 'phenomenon'" (SZ 29) from the "*not-showing-itself*" (*ibid.*) of an entity in appearing (*erscheinen*) through something else, i.e., a symptom. Only insofar as a symptom is showing-itself, appearance can turn into a form of mere semblance. It seemed to be a swarm of swallows announcing the summer while truly there were only sparrows in the sky. Solely what itself "makes a pretense to be manifest can be a semblance" (GA20:111).

Heidegger describes the modification that constitutes seeming more closely as a falling (*verfallen*) of what has been once discovered and a phenomenon "to the point of getting covered up again." "This covering-up can become complete; or rather – and as a rule – what has been discovered earlier may still be visible, though only as a semblance" (SZ 36; cf. GA20:112). Heidegger calls this kind of cover-up "disguise." To him, it is "both the most frequent and the most dangerous [kind], for here the possibilities of deceiving and misleading are especially stubborn" (SZ 36). "*Because Dasein is essentially falling, its state of being is such that it is in 'untruth'*" (SZ 222), as Heidegger explains the frequency of disguising. In the *Davos Disputation*, Heidegger invokes "the finitude of the being-in-truth of human beings" as reason for untruth's belonging "to the innermost core of the structure of Dasein" (GA3:281). Accordingly, it is crucial to "grasp from the beginning how semblance necessarily belongs to the nature of human beings" (GA3:275).

That a phenomenon in disguise is only partially hidden enables its rediscovery: "only in so far as entities within-the-world have been uncovered along with Dasein, have such entities, as possibly encounterable within-the-world, been covered up (hidden) or disguised" (SZ 222). Heidegger repeatedly uses the slogan "so much semblance, so much 'being'" (SZ 36; GA20:112). Consequentially, uncovering has to depart "from uncoveredness in the mode of semblance" (SZ 222). "Wherever semblance is identified, wherever semblance is apprehended and understood, there one already finds the allusion to something positive of which the seeming

is the semblance. This 'of which' is not something 'behind' the experience but shines forth in the semblance itself. This precisely is the essence of seeming" (GA20:189). What falsely shows-itself in seeming is not nothing, even though "it lacks something," it is "affected with a defect" (GA24:295). Methodically, this entails that "Dasein should explicitly appropriate what has already been uncovered, defend it *against* semblance and disguise, and assure itself of its uncoveredness again and again" (SZ 222).

In his 1937 course on Nietzsche, Heidegger refutes the Husserlian phenomenological analysis of seeming as too straightforwardly being up to "'hyletic' data for a consciousness"[1] (GA87:101) and stresses the connection to Dasein in the analysis. In this respect, he also states: "The seeming refers not primarily and not exclusively to 'things'" (*ibid.*). This was his position already in *Being and Time*, for – apart from the introduction of the concept – examples of seeming are instances of falling. In one case alone, "the illusion [*Schein*] arises that 'at first' only a Thing is occurrent" (SZ 369).

(2) In the *Introduction to Metaphysics*, Heidegger reformulates his conception of seeming without reference to phenomenology. As a result, appearing (*erscheinen*) is now equated with manifestation (*Vor-schein*) of something and is the second of altogether three modes of seeming. The first mode is "luster and glow." "The sun, for example … shines [*scheint*] – that is it glows and in glowing appears" (GA40:107/105; cf. GA54:158: "What shines is what shows itself for a looking"[2]). The third mode is "mere seeming, the semblance [*Anschein*] presented by something" (*ibid.*). The importance of the two first modes is underlined by the declaration: "The essence of seeming lies in appearing. … *Seeming* means exactly the same as *being* here" (*ibid.*). But the respective distinctions of being and seeming from not-being "do not coincide" (GA40:117/115). The mediating term between seeming and being is becoming. "Just as becoming is the seeming of being, seeming as appearing is the becoming of being" (GA40:123/122).

The second major conceptual change is the reframing of the analysis by the opposition of concealment and UNCONCEALMENT. Heidegger speaks of the "concealed unity of being and seeming" (GA40:106/104; cf. GA87:128); the "struggle between seeming (concealment and distortion) and unconcealment (being)" (GA40:114/112); and the "errancy" (*Irre*) – the "space, so to speak, that opens itself up in the interlocking of Being, unconcealment, and seeming" (GA40:116/115). The errancy is the world which human beings inhabit. Here, "seeming … covers itself over as seeming, inasmuch as it shows itself as being" (GA40:116/114). Therefore, true knowledge cannot be about being alone. It comprises the hardiness "to bring Dasein upon itself into the decision about being, not-being, and seeming" (GA40:121/120). Heidegger identifies this decision with the Parmenidean way of encountering the human opinions (*doxai*).

The reconceptualization of seeming was initiated by Heidegger's contemplation of Schiller's and Nietzsche's positive account of semblance in works of art (cf. GA87:111–32).[3] The *Nietzsche Lectures* explain that "art and truth are modes of perspectival shining" (GA6.1:219/N1 216). But, while truth is the semblance of constancy which is necessary for every living being and entails the risk that "what becomes manifest in one perspective petrifies and is taken to be the sole

---

[1] Edmund Husserl provides a list of the non-intentional "hyletic data" (i.e., data not yet related to external objects) in his 1925 lectures on *Phenomenological Psychology*: "data of color, data of tone, data of smell, data of pain, etc., considered purely subjectively, therefore here without thinking of the bodily organs or anything psychophysical. The expression *hyle* suggests this being a core (being matter for functions of consciousness)" (Husserl 1977b, §31, 128).

[2] See also GA9:225/173 on Plato's idea: "The ἰδέα is pure shining in the sense of the phrase 'the sun shines'. … This is what brings about presencing, specifically the coming to presence of what a being is in any given instance."

[3] On Schiller's account of semblance, see also Heidegger 2005b, 126f., 131.

definitive appearance, to the disregard of the other perspectives" (GA6.1:216/N1 214); art is also "semblance as the shining forth of new possibilities in that semblance" (GA6.1:550/N3 127) and is thus transfiguration (*Verklärung*) – "a becoming that lifts entities, that is, what has become fixed, stable, and congealed over and beyond to new possibilities" (GA6.1:511/N3 81). In this sense, "philosophy too is 'art'" (GA6.1:556/N3 123) and, consequently, "the most genuine and profound will to semblance, namely, to the scintillation of what transfigures" (GA6.1:219/N1 216).

<div align="right">

Christian Schmidt

</div>

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Instances of falling as examples for seeming SZ 174, 176, 257, 369; GA20:359
λόγος and shining GA79:108
Unconcealment and shining GA54:203; GA87:130f.
Shining in poetry and paintings GA5:43/32; GA13:95ff., 120f.; GA81:347f.
Semblance in Parmenides SZ 222f.; GA22:63–66; GA54:6, 13f.

FURTHER READING

Lacoue-Labarthe 2007b, Neumann 2006, Ziegler 2014

181.
SELFHOOD (*SELBSTHEIT*)

S ELFHOOD IS THE quality of being a self or an individual. According to Heidegger, to be a self is to be a particular way of disclosing situations by polarizing the AFFORDANCES of a situation into particular solicitations to act. Selfhood is usually taken to involve a capacity for reflexivity (that is, the ability to relate to oneself by, for instance, thinking about oneself or acting on oneself). For Heidegger, the most vital form of reflexivity involved in selfhood lies in the capacity a self has to take responsibility for who she is and what she does. This is because, for Heidegger, selfhood is at root "a *way of existing*" (SZ 267). Being a self is not to be reduced to an OCCURRENT property of a particular occurrent substance – whether a soul, an enduring consciousness, or a brain. The reflexivity of selfhood is thus not, for Heidegger, primarily tied up with self-consciousness or self-awareness.

On Heidegger's account, selfhood is found first of all in an agent's capacity to disclose a situation in a way that is specific and responsive to that agent's own individual style of BEING IN THE WORLD. Second, selfhood is found in that agent's capacity to determine for herself – to "own" – her way of disclosing situations. "The DASEIN," as Heidegger puts it, "is as selfhood for the sake of itself" (GA24:428). In Heidegger's later writings, selfhood is tied less to an individual or authentic mode of being in the world (see AUTHENTICITY), and more to our capacity to receive and embody an understanding of being. Ultimately, to be a self is to take responsibility for the way the world shows up as inviting or soliciting us to pursue the activities that sustain a historical form of life. "The essence of selfhood," Heidegger explains in the *Beiträge*, "means: the human being's essence (the guardianship of BEYNG) belongs to him or her, insofar as he or she is grounded in being-there [*Da-sein*]" (GA65:489).

One traditional way of approaching the question of selfhood is to ask: What exactly is picked out by first person pronouns like "I" or "me"? But what "I" picks out, Heidegger observes, depends on the particular context of inquiry: "The word 'I' can only be understood in the sense of a non-binding FORMAL INDICATION of something that perhaps might be unveiled as its 'contrary' in a particular phenomenal being-context" (SZ 116). Locke made much the same point in arguing that, when I refer to myself as the performer of some deed, "I" is applied to me qua human being – that is, me as a living, organized animal body of human form which, as such, is capable of entering into causal relations with other entities. When I refer to myself as having CONSCIOUSNESS (and thus the power of recollection), on the other hand, Locke argued that "I" is applied to me qua "person" – to me as "a thinking intelligent being, that has reason and reflection" (Locke 1997, Book II, chap. XXVII, §9). I-qua-human and I-qua-person are not necessarily opposed – indeed, as Locke notes, the same human being is ordinarily "presumed to be the same person" (*ibid.*, §20). But each – the I-qua-human-being and the I-qua-person – shows up relative to a different context of reference. Thus it is possible that in some particular instance, what is picked out as *me* relative to one context is *not-me* relative to the other. Indeed, that is what Locke thinks happens when, for instance, I perform some action and then go insane. Relative to the context of humanity, I am the same self both before and after. I am now still the

same body that performed the deed in the past. But relative to the context of personhood, the consciousness that accompanied the deed is not-I to the mad man. Locke concludes of such an individual that "the selfsame person was no longer in that man" (*ibid.*, §21).

In addition to referring to the I-qua-person, "I" can also be taken to refer to a spirit-substance in which personhood adheres. For instance, when religions posit a soul that survives death and is capable of being resurrected or reincarnated, this often amounts to holding that there is a spirit-substance that is truly definitive of me. (Of course, many people are skeptical that any such spirit substance exists.)

Another candidate for a referent for the word "I" is what one might call the "psychological self" of an individual – the "enduring structure within the person, his or her own individual combination of beliefs, goals, habits, and traits of character and personality, the pattern that as we might say *makes* the person who he is" (Perry 2005, 20). If someone loses a central element of their personality (perhaps through illness or depression), they or their loved ones often describe them as no longer being him- or herself, or being a stranger, a different person. A variation on the psychological approach to selfhood is to treat the true self as some subset of my occurrent psychological traits – for instance, the set of my most natural untutored urges and desires, or perhaps my "desire to act in accordance with reasons."[1] Others might consider the self to be those traits or characteristics that I most aspire to possess. Who I really am, on this view, isn't what I now am but what I want to be.

Yet another candidate to be a referent for the word "I" is the social or practical role that I fill (or aspire to fill), the practical identity in terms of which I understand myself and on the basis of which I encounter the world. We are: fathers or mothers, philosophers or plumbers or soldiers, Belgians or Brazilians, Catholics or atheists. Such roles give us a way to interpret ourselves, our situations, our comrades, our tasks, and they give us reasons to act. By understanding myself in terms of such interpretive identities or roles, I get a grip on myself as the individual I am.[2]

Other philosophers have taken the primary referent of the "I" to be that ground on the basis of which experiences can be unified into an orderly and coherent stream – for instance Mark Johnston's "arena of presence and action" (Johnston 2011, 137) or Dan Zahavi's "experiential self" (Zahavi 2015) or Husserl's "pure ego": "that which is one and the same in the changing of . . . lived experiences, as 'subject' of the acts and states."[3]

But none of these ways of thinking about the self gets to the notion of selfhood that is central in Heidegger's account of the self. For Heidegger, the self is the disclosive function that an agent performs. It is in virtue of the particular individual, with her specific projects, dispositions, skills, and practices, that a situation shows up in such a way as to support or favor certain actions and discourage others.

Thus, for instance, Heidegger argues that most of the time, we are not our ownmost selves, but the ANYONE-self (*das Man-Selbst*): "the self of the everyday Dasein is the *anyone-self*" (SZ 129). The anyone-self "orders" "the everyday possibilities of being" (SZ 126). When an inauthentic self is *there*, the SITUATION that speaks to anyone is disclosed. Heidegger's name

---

[1] Velleman proposes that "the desire to act in accordance with reasons can perform the functions that are attributed to its subject in his capacity as agent," and thus "*is* the agent, functionally speaking" (Velleman 1992, 479–80).

[2] See, e.g., Korsgaard 1996, 120ff.; and Crowell 2013, 290ff.

[3] Husserl 1989, 103. Heidegger's relationship to this concept of a pure ego is nuanced and subtle. He sees it as a correct way of "prescribing the direction" for an inquiry into the self, but criticizes it for its tendency to promote a view of the I or self as an occurrent entity. See SZ §64.

for such a situation is "the general situation" (*die allgemeine Lage*) – that is, a situation that is not indexed to the individuality of any particular person, but rather one that solicits us all to respond in a common, average way. Authenticity, by contrast, is "owned being-a-self" (*das eigentliche Selbstsein*). When an authentic self is there, the situation (*die Situation*) that shows up is indexed to the person in her individuality (see SZ 299–300).

In the chapter of *Being and Time* devoted to the theme of the self,[4] Heidegger explains that words like "I" and "here," "you" and "there," "have a signification that is prior to any differentiation between locative adverbs and personal pronouns" (SZ 119). The meaning of such terms is grounded in the fact that "when we interpret Dasein without any theoretical distortions we can see it immediately in its spatial 'being in the midst' of the world with which it concerns itself – a being in the midst that establishes distances and organizes" entities into coherent contexts of affordances (SZ 119–20). That is, "I" functions in the same way that "here" does; "you" functions in the same way "there" does: each points not to "particular existing things" (GA20:343) nor to a spot on a spatial grid, a point in objective space. They indicate rather a particular "location" in a field of possible actions – "I here" am an ability to act; "you there" are a different ability.

The "location" that each of us *is* can be understood as a particular way of making some affordances stand out as more pressing or inviting than other, and of aligning affordances into coherent trajectories to be followed in pursuing our projects. I and you are each of us a distinct way of being there. This is what Heidegger means when he says, famously, "Dasein is its world existingly" (SZ 364). That means that we, as particular entities, are at most notionally separable from our environment. We need a particular setting in order to pursue our purposes, while that setting itself only shows up in terms of our purposes:

> Dasein exists for the sake of an ability-to-be of its self. In existing, it has been thrown; and as something thrown, it has been delivered over to entities which it needs in order to be able to be as it is – namely, for the sake of its self. In so far as Dasein exists factically, it understands itself in the way its "for-the-sake-of-itself" is thus connected with some current "in-order-to". . . . Dasein is its world existingly. (SZ 364)

In this interplay between a particular Dasein's purposive commitment (the "for-the-sake-of-itself") and a particular situation's affordances (the current "in-order-to's"), the plethora of options for action are aligned and coordinated into patterns of possibilities, thus "disclosing the current factical affordance character of the circumstances" (SZ 300). When I bring into a setting my aim or goal, the affordances that serve my purposes coalesce more clearly, gaining weight and exerting a pull on me. Those that detract from my purposes withdraw themselves from consideration:

> The ready possession of possibilities belongs to existence, however, because, as projecting, it is disposed in the midst of entities. Certain other possibilities are thereby already withdrawn from existence, and indeed merely through its own facticity. Yet precisely this withdrawal of certain possibilities pertaining to its ability to be-in-the-world – a withdrawal entailed in its being absorbed by entities – first

---

[4] Division i, chap. iv: "Being-in-the-world as being-with and being-a-self. The 'anyone.'" Heidegger returns repeatedly to the theme of selfhood at various points in Division ii, including §64 "Care and selfhood."

brings those possibilities of world-projection that can "actually" be seized upon toward existence as its world. Such withdrawal is precisely what procures for the obligatoriness of what remains projected before us the power to prevail within the realm of Dasein's existence. (GA9:167/128–29)

Certain affordances have the "power to prevail" and succeed in drawing me into action only because I, "through my own FACTICITY" (that is, through my particular characteristics, preferences, skills, etc.), "polarize" the situation, making some affordances withdraw and others stand out as obligatory.[5]

Because the existential "location" that I am is constantly changing, "I" does not pick out an entity or a stable property of entities: "selfhood was formally defined as *a way of existing*, and that means not as an occurrent entity" (SZ 267). Rather, Heidegger would say there is an "I" there where a coherent, unified way of withdrawing affordances and dispositions succeeds in clearing the way for fluid action. The "I" picks out my particular way of polarizing affordances into solicitations to act.[6]

The "subjectivity" of my world, in other words, is found in the fact that I (qua agent) am drawn to act by affordances which might not even appear to someone else, or which he or she might recognize as mere affordances to a hypothetical action but not as soliciting a response.

If there is anything stable or constant to the self of existence,[7] it is the constancy of a way or style of proceeding in one's dealings with the world, a style that carries over from one situation to the next. As an existing I, I am capable of an "own self" mode – that is, having a way or style of polarizing the situations I am in so that they sustain me in a trajectory of existence that expresses a distinct individuality. But I can also exist in a "not myself" mode, so that I light up and respond to solicitations to action that express someone other than my own self. Of course, in cases of both authentic or inauthentic ways of polarizing a situation, there is an "I" involved. To be a being-in-the-world is always to be in a "location" that presents one with coherent, organized patterns of affordance and solicitation. But that "I" doesn't necessarily coincide with being my own self.

Mark A. Wrathall

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 116–17, 128–29, 181, 193, 221, 252, 267, 273–74, 284, 293, 296–300, 303, 316–24, 332, 354, 373, 383, 433; GA3:156–57, 187, 190, 195; GA5:104/79; GA13:68; GA20:341; GA21:236, 297, 338–42, 405; GA23:140, 152; GA24:194, 207, 225–29, 242–43, 422, 425; GA25:269, 379–83, 390–96; GA26:175–76, 241–47; GA27:323–24, 371, 375; GA28:67, 116, 121–22, 181, 302; GA29/30:203, 215, 332, 339–40, 347, 397–98, 426; GA31:24; GA32:22, 27, 33, 160, 188, 192, 196, 199, 211; GA36/37:218–19, 257; GA38:35ff./32ff.; GA40:152/153; GA42:145, 245–46, 250; GA43:181;

---

[5] The idea of polarizing affordances in particular, and my reading of Heidegger's account of selfhood in general, is influenced and inspired by Maurice Merleau-Ponty's account of *être au monde* – itself an interpretation and elaboration of Heidegger's notion of the self as a being-in-the-world. See Merleau-Ponty 2012, 115/143.

[6] "Existence 'clears away,'" Heidegger says, "insofar as it factically exists" (SZ 299). This is probably the phenomenon Sartre was describing when he wrote: "I am absolutely nothing. There is nothing *there* but a pure nothingness encircling a certain objective ensemble and throwing it into relief outlined upon the world, but this ensemble is a real system, a disposition of means in view of an end" (Sartre 1956, 349).

[7] And whether there is or not stability or constancy in any given instance is an open question (see, e.g., SZ 117). Authenticity, Heidegger argues, involves achieving the right kind of stability or constancy in the self – "the 'self-constancy' of the existing self" (SZ 303). This constancy is achieved in RESOLUTENESS.

GA44:23; GA46:43, 231; GA47:174, 256, 303; GA48:176, 178, 194–95, 204, 211, 218, 222; GA49:42, 60, 75, 80, 90, 97, 100, 113, 117, 136–38, 162–63, 171, 177, 190, 195–96; GA51:47; GA54:195, 205; GA55:219, 316, 358; GA58:13, 57, 62, 68, 156, 164–66, 205–06, 232, 257–60; GA59:158–59, 167–69, 173; GA60:196, 208, 217, 228–29, 238–40, 245, 248, 253–54; GA61:95; GA65:31, 49–52, 67–68, 71, 245, 265, 300, 303, 316–17, 319–22, 375–76, 398, 489; GA66:117, 138–40, 148, 155, 324; GA67:66; GA68:27, 76–77, 114; GA70:57; GA77:149; GA85:12, 18, 76, 85, 143–44, 151, 156; GA87:17; GA90:65, 156

FURTHER READING

Wrathall 2015b, Wrathall 2017c

SEMBLANCE (*SCHEIN*). SEE SEEMING.

182.
SENSE (*SINN*)

SENSE IS THE interpretable or articulable structure of DASEIN's projected UNDERSTANDING of the WORLD. It functions as an indeterminate basis or ground that is presupposed in developing more determinate forms of understanding. The concept of sense plays an important role in defining Heidegger's project by highlighting BEING as just such an indeterminate ground of all understanding of entities. Although some characterizations of his method continue to suggest a central role for the notion of sense, the later Heidegger eschews this as a technical term, due to its subjectivist connotations, and finds alternative terms – such as "pathway" – to describe the structures he had previously labeled sense.

Sense (*Sinn*) is one of several terms Heidegger uses in *Being and Time* to describe features of the transformation of indeterminate background meaning – that is, sense – into distinct or delimited meanings (*Bedeutungen*) capable of being marked by an expression. This term is of particular importance because Heidegger uses it to define his project of taking up the "question" of the "sense of being" (*Sinn von Sein*, SZ 1).

Despite this, Heidegger does not discuss the notion of sense at length, instead offering several terse characterizations of it while discussing the relationship between understanding and INTERPRETATION in §32. He there connects sense with the correlative notions of understanding (*Verstehen*) and Dasein's projection (*Entwurf*), as that in which "the understandability" (*Verständlichkeit*) of entities is "held" and that onto or toward which the projection tends (its *Woraufhin*, SZ 151, see also 324). The point of this connection is that sense contrasts with and is prior to interpretation, the level of disclosure at which specific entities or features are identified, or picked out, and so become "understandable as something." For this reason Heidegger also describes sense as that which is "articulable" (*artikulierbar*) in "understanding disclosing" (*verstehenden Erschließen*, SZ 151) and in interpretation (SZ 161). However, in order to ground or shape articulate meanings – to be "articulable" – sense must already have a specific constitution or form of its own. Hence, despite its lacking the kind of "ARTICULATION" that interpretation brings, Heidegger characterizes sense as being already "structured by pre-having, pre-seeing and pre-grasping," together comprising the "pre-structure of understanding" that interpretation presupposes (SZ 151).

To appreciate his point here, consider how we might look into a crowd of people without picking out single faces. Each face is somehow present within our field of view, and we are free to focus on it (perhaps noticing that it is someone we know), but it is not fully formed in our vision, waiting for us to pick up on it, as it might be in a sharply focused photograph. Rather, we initially see a mass of unfocused, indistinctly given faces, with each face taking on sharp contours only once we focus on it, drawing it out from its less focused surroundings. Moreover, in the case of vision it is easy to appreciate that in order to focus on and pick out particular features in this way, they must already be present in our field of view.

Heidegger's point is that Dasein's projection of its world works in the same way. Prior to picking out entities or features specifically – "thematically," as he often puts it (e.g., SZ 145,

324) – a human agent will already have an overall grasp of the world that is (pre)structured, but in which they have not been antecedently defined. As in the vision case, the sense inherent in Dasein's projection (and grasped by understanding) is an intermediate formation, an inchoate structure that can be further developed or "articulated" to take on more specific form. In this respect it might be best compared not with a photograph but with a painting, as something built up gradually from initial marks and contours that constrain but do not fully determine the picture being produced.

Heidegger identifies several further features of sense. First, it is important that the notion of sense conveys directedness, a direction of movement or striving that defines Dasein's projection (its *Woraufhin*). Second, like the other structures to which Heidegger relates it in *Being and Time*, sense is an "existentiale." Thus, in view of its inchoate, indeterminate structure, he also describes sense as the "formal-existential framework" of the disclosure belonging to understanding (SZ 151, 156). In contrast to a fully defined plan (SZ 145), this formal "framework" of sense amounts to a rough outline of what we are and where we are headed – an overall sense of purpose – that takes on specific form as we live our lives. Such movement toward structures of greater determinacy also underlies, third, Heidegger's view of the way interpretation depends on presuppositions. This dependence, he suggests, should be understood not on the model of circular reasoning, but as refining or fleshing out understanding by developing indeterminate background sense into more determinate interpretations (SZ 152–53). Finally, sense has an inherently temporal constitution. Because it both anticipates more determinate disclosure by sketching out in advance (sense is *vorgezeichnet*, SZ 153) and involves directedness, the sense of a projection entails a differentiation of present and future that must ultimately be understood in terms of Dasein's TEMPORALITY (see SZ 323–31).

Heidegger's notion of sense has both an intuitive and a technical connection with the idea of something's making sense. As implied by calling it an existentiale, for Heidegger only Dasein can literally have sense – existential directedness – or be senseless (be *sinnvoll* or *sinnlos*); other entities neither have nor lack sense and are therefore "non-sensical" (*unsinnig*), although they can become "counter to sense" (*widersinnig*) by proving an obstacle to human projects (SZ 151f.). Part of the point of these latter claims is to deny that sense is primarily a property of propositional judgments, as often assumed by logicians, particularly since Frege. Instead, on Heidegger's view, propositional judgments have (or make) sense only derivatively in virtue of their relation to Dasein's projective sense-making (SZ 153f., 156).

The preceding characterization of sense sheds light on the relation between this and Heidegger's use of the term "meaning" (*Bedeutung*). Although some German-speaking philosophers contrast them, Heidegger routinely uses both terms in talking about word meaning, and conceives the two as closely linked, such that meanings are always "sense-like" (*sinnhaft*, SZ 161). Despite this, sense remains for him a richer structure than the delimited or articulated meaning – *Bedeutung* in his technical sense – of specific words. Sense encompasses all the interpretable features of a projection, it is the inchoate "pre-structure" that underlies the articulation or delimitation of meanings, and is therefore not reducible to the latter. Heidegger's question about the "sense of being" relies on this distinction. Its concern is not with the delimited meaning of the word "being" but with that richer, less determinate structure that underlies any understanding of entities, sense as that "whence and on the basis of which being altogether can as such become manifest and come into truth" (GA6.1:15f./N1 18). This is part of the reason – in addition to the novelty of his question – that Heidegger emphasizes that

talking about the "sense of being" requires concepts that differ essentially from "the concepts in which that which is attains its determinacy in terms of meanings [*bedeutungsmäßige Bestimmtheit*]" (SZ 6).

Despite its centrality in defining Heidegger's project in *Being and Time*, the notion of sense seems to disappear in later works. Indeed, Heidegger explicitly states that "the expression 'sense of being'" has been "replaced by 'TRUTH of being'" (GA15:335/FS 41; see also GA14:36). Although he considers these two expressions to be effectively synonyms in the context of his thought (see GA9:377/286; GA5:100/76; GA65:43), Heidegger suggests that the term "sense" has become "inadequate" because its connection with understanding and projection in *Being and Time* wrongly intimates that projection is a "human feat," something like a "structure of subjectivity" (GA15:334f./FS 40f.). However, the disappearance of the notion of sense is not complete and there are several indications that Heidegger remains closer to his early position than it may initially appear.

One such indication is that a reference to "sense" (*Sinn*) is retained in some of the terms Heidegger uses to characterize the method of his own work. This is particularly clear with the term *Besinnung* – thinking about, deliberation or contemplation – that Heidegger often uses in later works to refer to his own method of REFLECTION, as a method that contrasts with scientific enquiry in allowing its subject-matter to manifest itself without coercion. Indeed Heidegger himself emphasizes this link by defining reflection (*Besinnung*) as "enquiring about *sense*" (GA65:43) and highlights the German term's somewhat meditative or spiritual feel in explaining that the "essence of *Besinnung*" is to allow oneself to be involved in or to give oneself over to "sense" (*sich auf den Sinn einlassen*, GA7:63/QCT 180). A connection with sense also resonates in several other terms the later Heidegger uses in characterizing his own activity. For example, in emphasizing the proximity of THINKING and POETRY, he sometimes talks of "sensing Thinking" (*sinnendes Denken*) to signal that both require the same kind of receptivity to the underlying "saying" of LANGUAGE (GA12:256/OWL 136, see also 186/91 and 195/99–100). Similarly, he uses the verb *nachsinnen* – another verb translatable as to think about or contemplate – to highlight his interest, as conveyed by the prefix *nach*, in following, tracking, or tracing sense (e.g., GA11:12/WP 40; GA12:150, 190, 250/OWL 58, 95, 130).

Each of these methodological terms continues to hint at a central role for the notion of sense, so that one might wonder why the later Heidegger disavows it as a technical term. In fact, it would be more accurate to say that Heidegger's earlier notion of sense is superseded by the closely related notion of pathways (*Wege*), which performs a similar role while avoiding the potentially subjectivist connotations of a "projection" or its sense. Heidegger highlights the relation between sense and pathways by drawing on etymological connections that connect the verb *sinnen* (which he uses to define *Besinnung*) with the Old High German *sinnan*: "'*Sinnan*' originally means: to travel, strive towards . . ., adopt a direction; the Indogermanic root *sent* and *set* means pathway [*Weg*]" (GA12:49). Further: "The *sense* is the pathway [*Weg*], the direction of the pathway [*Wegrichtung*] that a thing [*Sache*] takes. Sense is the open direction of the pathway that a thing has already adopted" (GA7:62n.).

Heidegger also exploits the relation between sense and pathways in discussing the methodological concepts above. Thus to give oneself over to sense – the "essence of reflection [*Besinnung*]" – is also to "adopt a pathway's direction" (*eine Wegrichtung einschlagen*, GA7:63/QCT 179–80). To track or follow sense (*nachsinnen*) is to follow a "particular pathway," to be "led" in the right "direction" by a "pathway," to decide on a "long pathway in thought

[*Denkweg*]" that leads to improved understanding of our initial surroundings (GA12:190, 245, 197/OWL 95, 125–26, 101–02). Finally, for "sensing Thinking" the "pathway" leads to a "region" (*Gegend*) that Heidegger in turn sees as giving rise to those pathways in a movement of "making pathways" (*Be-wëgung*, GA12:186/OWL 91–92).

Thus the relation between sense and pathways is not merely etymological. Rather, the kind of structure Heidegger had previously called sense, the underlying matrix or ground for articulated meanings, is now described in terms of pathways. The later term also sustains the same relation to Heidegger's reflective method as sense – namely, pointing to the target structure out of which and on the basis of which being can become manifest. Further, as part of a more general reliance on geographical tropes – place, region, the "topology of BEYNG" – his later talk of pathways also avoids (as intended) suggesting a special link with subjectivity (GA15:335/FS 40–41) while echoing the connotation of direction or directedness that had defined projective sense.

Ultimately, Heidegger even hints that the notion of sense might be derivative of that of pathways. "The word 'pathway,'" he says, "is presumably a primordial word of the language that speaks to the sensing human [*dem sinnenden Menschen zuspricht*]," such that the notion of sense might be properly understood by considering the pathway that makes all pathways (*der alles bewëgende Weg*, GA12:187/OWL 92).

Andrew Inkpin

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 151–54, 156, 161, 323–25; GA6.1:15–16/N1 18–19; GA6.2:20/N3 181; GA12:49/OWL 173; GA15:334–35/FS 40–41
Sense and truth of being GA14:36; GA15:335/FS 41; GA65:43

FURTHER READING

Dreyfus 1991, 215–24, Wrathall 2011, 2–3, 95–156, Wrathall 2013a, 206–07, 339–41, Wrathall 2017b

SENTENCE (*SATZ*). SEE PRINCIPLE.

SET BEFORE (*VORSTELLEN*). SEE REPRESENTATION.

SETTING INTO PERSPECTIVE (*AUSEINANDERSETZUNG*). SEE CONFRONTATION.

SETTING APART (*AUSEINANDERSETZUNG*). SEE CONFRONTATION.

SETTLEMENT (*AUSTRAG*). SEE DISPOSITION.

SHARED WORLD (*MITWELT*). SEE BEING-WITH.

SHINE, SHINE FORTH (*SCHEINEN*). SEE SEEMING.

183.
SHOWING (*ZEIGEN*)

Sнowing is allowing to be seen or grasped. The notion of pointing or showing (*zeigen*) is central to Heidegger's conception of PHENOMENOLOGY both before and after *Being and Time*. Heidegger introduces his conception of phenomenon as something that shows itself (*das Sichzeigende*, SZ 28; GA14:99). Showing and showing itself are constitutive of DASEIN itself. The demonstrative expression *da* meaning here (its primary meaning), but also THERE, is built into Heidegger's notion of Dasein. Our competence in the demonstrative is grounded in a contextually disclosed truth: "this entity carries in the being most proper to it the character of not being closed off. In the expression 'here' ["*da*"] we have in view this essential disclosure. By reason of this disclosure, this entity (Dasein), together with the world being-here ["*Da-sein*"], is 'here" ["*da*"] for itself" (SZ 132). In terms of the expression showing or pointing (*zeigen*), the dependence of demonstrative significance on truth as disclosure is reflected in the grounding of showing (*zeigen*) in showing itself (*sich zeigen*) to be. Our grip on statements and their truth is also a function of showing: "The primary signification of 'statement' [*Aussage*, usually falsely translated as "assertion"] is showing [*Aufzeigung*]" (SZ 154). Statements show things to us by isolating things from the comprehensive context of significance that is being and our BEING-IN-THE-WORLD. "The statement is true means … it shows [*zeigt auf*] … the entity in its uncoveredness" (SZ 218). Such uncoveredness shown in statements is the "showing itself of an entity" (SZ 218). The showing or pointing out (*Aufzeigung*) of entities involved in the making of statements (*Aussagen*) and assertions (*Behauptungen*) is parasitic on the general context of showing and interpretation and our being-in-the-world. From this contextual showing Heidegger derives the limit notion of something that shows itself to us only in terms that are bare of all its showing relations (this is the OCCURRENT as it is in itself).

Showing itself (*sich zeigen*) is a constitutive part of the DWELLING that already in *Being and Time* constitutes our *being-in-the-world*; dwelling is taken to have originally been signified both by "in" as *innan* and by *bin* as *bey*, so being-in is dwelling (SZ 54; cf. for the later Heidegger, "Building Dwelling Thinking," GA7:147ff.). Human beings are not simply located in the world in relation to objects that are simply located; this picture of things is what Heidegger calls the occurrent (*das Vorhandene*). Instead, we have no grip on ourselves or on anything else that is not also an understanding engagement with the wider context of significance in which everything is embedded and to which everything ultimately also points. The wider context of significance is what gives meaning to being or rather is that to which being gives meaning. In grasping our own being and that of other entities, we also have a grasp of temporal, and historical, conditions and also of our place in our spatial context. Heidegger lays this out well in his lecture on the "Concept of Time" from 1924:

> if characters of being are to be discovered in an entity, then this entity must already have previously come into the field of view belonging to ontological research. The entity must show *itself* from itself [*sich von ihm selbst her zeigen*], that is, it must *phainesthai*, become phenomenon and be spoken of as it shows itself. … Historicity is a character of being. Of which being [*Seienden*]? Of human Dasein. … The basic ontological

constitution of Dasein off of which historicity can be read ontologically, is TEMPOR-ALITY. Thus the task of understanding historicity leads to the phenomenological explication of TIME. (GA64:4)

For Heidegger, that which shows itself is ultimately being itself. What also shows itself insofar as being shows itself are the ways in which our own being qua Dasein and the distinctive being of other kinds of "things," thus EXISTENTIALS and categories, are manifest.

The ultimate phenomena for Heidegger are not particular entities, but systematic ways of being temporal; these phenomena show up through the process of FORMAL INDICATION (*formale Anzeige*). Heidegger takes over the term indication (*Anzeige*) from Husserl who uses it in the first of his *Logical Investigations* for the directly referential and demonstrative aspect of meaning and singular terms. Heidegger uses the term "formal indication" as a technical term for the procedure involved in his conception of phenomenology, especially as developed in *Being and Time*. It denotes the manner in which the significance of philosophical terms is unpacked and filled in contextually by appeal to the very process through which human existence constitutes significance for itself. Our understanding always begins in medias res with where we are. The formal aspect is the systematic character that allows us to get a grasp of the meaning in its specific context. In his lectures from the late teens, Heidegger takes the antecedently projective grasp (*Vorhabe*) that we have as agents with respect to a certain context in virtue of a kind of paradigm in which we work and applies it to the formal indication of the very conception of Dasein (GA63:80). Formal indication picks out the way of being of an entity in terms of a formal pattern of demonstrative significance that shows itself differentially. It is thereby the method by which a legitimately transcendental account of our being may be begun to be generated by each of us from out of our own dwelling as being-in-the-world.

For Heidegger the primary application of the method of formal indication is to gain a foothold in the ways of being of we who are engaged in the process of Dasein through which we and other entities are shown to and hidden from ourselves (GA61:18–20). "All assertions about the being of Dasein, all sentences about time, all sentences within the problematic of temporality have as expressed sentences the character of indication [*der Anzeige*]: they indicate [*indizieren*] Dasein only, although as expressed sentences they initially mean the occurrent; they indicate Dasein and struc-tures of Dasein and time, they indicate possible understanding and the possible understanding graspable in such structures of Dasein" (GA21:410). Heidegger takes the proper grasp of our Dasein in its distinctive ways to be indications [*Anzeigen*] that we have "transformed" our understanding from the vulgar understanding of things (GA29/30:430; cf. Dahlstrom 1994, 79off.). Formal indication strips concepts pertaining to our being-in-the-world of their vulgar significance and gives them their proper contextual significance in the first person singular and plural process of human existence (transformed into concepts that are understood in their distinctive MINENESS, since "Dasein is always . . . *mine*," GA29/30:429). In *Being and Time*, Heidegger indicates that "I" is something that can reveal itself to be the opposite of what it is taken to be in "non-committal formal indication" (SZ 116). Formal indication needs to methodically transform the illusion that I is an object (implicit in rational and empiricist psychology): "but insofar as one takes these [philosophical] concepts indication-free [*anzeigefrei*] like a scientific concept in the vulgar conception of the under-standing, the inquiry of philosophy will be led astray in every individual problem" (GA29/30:429). Thus the conclusion would be the opposite of the one suggested by Dreyfus and Taylor. Dreyfus and Taylor interpret the way in which non-committal formal indication works to establish a reference to the real world in a metaphysically robust plural realist sense that they associate with a Kripkean causal

theory of reference (Dreyfus and Taylor 2015, esp. 160–61). They interpret Heidegger's notion of the de-worlding that goes into theoretical description as capturing things antecedent to all of our engaged agency in our being-in-the-world rather than as an abstraction from that being-in-the-world (*ibid.*, 140–41). A metaphysical or transcendental realist reading is not without some textual support (GA26:251). However, it is doubtful that formal indication can be read in terms of rigid designation and causal relations to scientific objects without doing violence to Heidegger's very conception of its role with respect to the understanding of Dasein (cf. Lafont 2002). Heidegger offers the application of causation to human freedom as an example of an "indication free" (*Anzeige frei*) use of concepts that give rise to "groundless questions" (GA29/30:429). It would be no different for him to apply causation to language and to formal indication, thus turning relations of Dasein to entities in the world into causal relations to worldless occurrent objects.

Due to its intimate connection with truth and being, showing remains central to Heidegger's later thought; things are also central to his later thought, but not in a manner that conflicts with their showing themselves as they are. Now the inner-worldly has lost any contrastive significance to things: "the presence of something present such as the jug comes into its own, appropriately manifests and determines itself, only from the thinging of the thing.... The THING things world" GA7:179, 182/PLT 175, 178). In showing, we grasp things in terms of their context and thus our context and being is itself present to us, too. In his later book *What is Called Thinking?* based on lecture courses (GA8:11/10), interpreting Hölderlin's line that we are "a sign" devoid of "interpretation" (*Deutung*), Heidegger argues that human beings are entities whose very essence consists in showing (*ein Zeigendes*) the being that escapes us but also sets the measure or norms for our thought about everything. In his "Conversation of the West" ("Das abendländische Gespräch"), Heidegger elaborates on showing by also introducing the notion of interpretive appropriation as showing again: "what is interpretation other than the lingering granted to the human being to show again [*wieder-zeigen*] that which shows itself [*das Sichzeigende*]?" (GA75:62). "If all interpretation is only response to what the sign shows [*zeigt*], then it remains a showing again [*Wieder-Zeigen*] of what the sign gives away. A re-petition of what seems to fall into the open without reception. That which shows itself [*das Sichzeigende*] seems to fall into that which is not preserved and yet cannot do so because in the interpretive bringing back and return of that which is shown [*des Gezeigten*] that which shows itself [*das Sichzeigende*] begins to shine and the sign *is*" (GA75:65). As Heidegger develops his position from *Being and Time*, he comes to focus his attention more and more on the encompassing context that makes it possible for things to show and point to other things.

Pierre Keller

FURTHER READING

Dahlstrom 1994, Kisiel 1993, Lafont 2002, Oudemans 1990, van Dyk 1991, Pöggeler 1980, Pöggeler 1989, Dreyfus and Taylor 2015

SIGNIFICANCE (*BEDEUTUNG*). SEE MEANING.

SIGNIFICATION (*BEDEUTUNG*). SEE MEANING.

184.
SIGNS (*ZEICHEN*)

Signs are ways of showing things to us. The German word translated as "sign," *Zeichen*, is a sign of any kind, the meaning of which is understood. A sign is distinct from an indication (*Anzeichen*, SZ 78), which is a "symptom" of something going on elsewhere. In his earliest work, Heidegger distinguishes a use of signs that is purely calculative in mathematics and mathematical logic from a use of signs that is genuinely meaning-bearing. In his work on the medieval scholastic philosophy of logic, language, and categories, Heidegger develops the account of the relationship of signs to truth in pseudo-Dun Scotus (Thomas of Erfurt) and again emphasizes the importance of meaning and INTENTIONALITY to the relationship that signs have to the TRUTH (GA1:296ff.). In the early 1920s, under the influence of the Marburg reading of truth in Greek philosophy as unhiddenness (*Unverborgenheit*) first developed in Nicolai Hartmann's *Platos Logik des Seins* (1909), Heidegger comes to interpret the intentionality relation of signs, their aboutness, in terms of their showing things in a context that always partially hides and leaves the truth unhidden (GA20:420, §3; GA14:99). Thus Heidegger grounds signs in truth (ALÊTHEIA understood as unhiddenness), in that which shows itself (*das Sichzeigende*, in his notion of phenomenon, GA14:99). Heidegger grounds the notion of sign (*Zeichen*) in the non-reflexive and the reflexive uses of pointing and SHOWING things as (*zeigen* and *sich zeigen*) that themselves constitute his understanding of what a phenomenon is for PHENOMENOLOGY (SZ 28; GA14:99).

Signs are constituted by a selective showing of what shows itself. The German word for "sign," *Zeichen*, comes from *zeihen*, originally "to show, to indicate," but now occurring only in poetic language meaning "to accuse someone." *Zeigen*, "to show, to point, to indicate," also comes from *zeihen*. This encourages Heidegger to connect *Zeichen* with *zeigen* (SZ 77). Heidegger connects the notion of sign (*Zeichen*) to the non-reflexive and the reflexive use of showing things (*zeigen*, showing things; and *sich zeigen*, things showing themselves to be); signs selectively show things to us that show themselves (that which shows itself is the phenomenon of Heidegger's ontological phenomenology). In the process of showing things, signs also show us our BEING-IN-THE-WORLD and show us our being precisely in those limit-situations in which the pattern in the significance of signs as EQUIPMENT breaks down. Signs have a specific function within the pattern of referential signification, appropriateness, and worldliness of equipment and the AVAILABLE in *Being and Time*. Signs display the pattern of referential signification, appropriateness, and worldliness that is otherwise only latent in equipment and tools. Every sign refers (*verweist*), but not every referral is a sign. A sign is equipment, that shows and signals: it is serviceable for and appropriate to signaling. And it also shows what it does in the context of a comprehensive differential context of significance and purposes for us as agents. Signs play a role for us as equipment; signs are available. However, the status of signs within the

context of equipment is more equivocal than it first appears to be. Heidegger follows Cassirer's conception of "primitive humanity" as antecedent to a developed distinction between sign and that which is designated by the sign (SZ 82; signs in mythic thought do not yet function unequivocally as tools within the context of equipment). Heidegger surmises that the notions of equipment and even the available may not apply to the way signs function in the "primitive" conception of world. Although signs are not limited to linguistic signs, LANGUAGE is an important dimension of signs. In language, signs serve as tools or equipment for communicating our thinking with others. However, language is not primarily a tool of communication for Heidegger. Language is constituted as speech and as a dialogue that we carry on with others and with ourselves. Speech itself is grounded in our relation to the world about us, and as such it is an existential condition for our Dasein. The use of equipment even for communication is only possible because we always already have a shared understanding of our being-in-the-world that "clothes" signs with their differential significance in what we do. In the breakdown of this context of significance we are also shown something of the fragility of the context of significance in which we move; we are thrown back on our very being and its fragility.

Signs serve as equipment, but they have the more fundamental status of belonging to Dasein like language. They may also become mere objects (occurrent) such as uninterpreted sign-designs in mathematical formalisms. That signs cannot be limited solely to the function and being of equipment is apparent from the later Heidegger. Following Hölderlin, he reads our very being as sign, as showing us something, our being, that we can never fully grasp. We as human beings are essentially a showing of the transcendent, a process of showing being as the event of the coming into its own (proper significance) of the truth about us and our world. In his later book *What is Called Thinking?* based on lecture courses (GA8:11/10), interpreting Hölderlin's line that we are "a sign" devoid of "interpretation" (*Deutung*), Heidegger argues that human beings are entities whose very essence consists in showing (*ein Zeigendes*) the being that escapes us. As such we are signs. Our being as the human beings that we are is a sign that shows the event of truth in which things come to be situated in the context appropriate to them and to our relationship to them and to being. According to *What is Called Thinking?* "we call 'sign' that the very essence of which is showing" (GA8:11/10). This is already true in *Being and Time* and it is no less true in Heidegger's later philosophy: "that which shows itself [*das Sichzeigende*] seems to fall into that which is not preserved and yet cannot do so because in the interpretive bringing back and returning of that which is shown (*des Gezeigten*) that which shows itself (*das Sichzeigende*) begins to shine and the sign *is*" (GA75:65).

Sometimes Heidegger reverts to a much less "profound" conception of sign; for instance, when he says that in a poem of George's "the words 'name' and 'word' are thought differently and more deeply than as mere signs [*als bloße Zeichen*]" (GA12:154/ OWL 61). Heidegger's pejorative reference to signs is connected to his critical attitude to the standing of mathematical LOGIC in contemporary philosophy. Heidegger devotes a section of *From the Experience of Thought* to signs, but it is a frontal attack on the significance of signs when taken as occurrent objects: "language represented as a mere institution of signs provides the basis for an information-theoretical technological transformation of language" (GA13:211). Mathematical logic interprets logic as a system of

signs and of models for the interpretation of those signs. Heidegger identifies such logical semiotics with an "overpowering calculating thought" and "measureless model-thinking" (GA13:211); everything becomes construed in information-theoretical terms as a possible object or model for the interpretation of a mathematical formalism of sign.

Pierre Keller

FURTHER READING

Carman 1991, Hartmann 1901, Höfner 2008, Hope 2014

SINGULARIZATION (*VEREINZELUNG*). SEE INDIVIDUALIZATION.

SITE (*ORT*). SEE PLACE.

185.
SITE (*STÄTTE*)

A SITE (STÄTTE) is a place that grants or allows something in its presencing. The use of the term draws attention to the *giving* of a place *for* something rather than the *gathering* or *opening* of place as such (the latter being associated with place in the sense of *Ort/Ortschaft* – "site" is also distinct from place as mere position, *Platz*). Typically a site is a site for "dwelling" (hence *Wohnstätte* – etymologically *Stätte* is related to *Stadt*, meaning "town"), and so can also be referred to as "abode." "Site" is one of the terms that signals Heidegger's increasing turn to questions of place and space in the period after *Being and Time* (especially in the post-war thinking). Appearing as a philosophically significant term from the mid-1930s onward, "site" appears in various contexts: as the site for the happening of truth (GA5:49/36–37); as the "site of the abode of human history" that is the "city" (*polis*) (GA53:101–02/82); and as the "site" that allows for the fourfold (GA7:156/151). See PLACE; TOPOLOGY.

Jeff Malpas

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA5:49/36–37, 56–57/42–43, 61/46; GA7:156–61/PLT 151–56; GA53:100–02/81–82; GA54:133–34/89–90, 142/96

FURTHER READING

Schatzki 2007

186.
SITUATION (*LAGE* AND *SITUATION*)

A GENERAL SITUATION (*Lage*) is an everyday situation *among* others within a form of life. An existential situation (*Situation*) is an extraordinary situation in which the viability of a form of life as a whole is at stake. So, an existential situation is one in which the very possibility of a general situation comes to a head. The contrast between these two situations is introduced abruptly in *Being and Time* at §60.

To approach the structure of a general situation, begin with one of Heidegger's most basic points about the phenomenology of everyday entities, namely that they are given to us as world-involving. Heidegger's EQUIPMENT well exemplifies the point (though the point generalizes beyond equipment). A tool is what it is for. To be what it is requires having a place, or a part to play, within an interconnected web of tools. The hammer, for example, is essentially a part bound together with other parts (nails) "working together" in appropriate ways within a particular nexus of engagement. However, the even wider whole that situates any local context is the everyday WORLD. After all, hammers have their point and significance within a "wide" world of contexts structured by the pursuit of carpentry projects. Accordingly, to comport toward a hammer as a hammer in a concrete context of significance (see MEANING) – that is, with UNDERSTANDING – is to appreciate the tool's potential situatedness in *other* contexts of significance in which the tool would find its appropriate place. In Heidegger's terms, our concerned absorption in a concrete context always already involves a sense of orientation beyond that context, toward other appropriate contexts, thanks to our "familiarity" with the world (SZ 86). The world so understood is the space of possibilities onto which these entities are projected in their being: "[This] familiarity, constitutive for DASEIN, goes to make up Dasein's understanding of BEING" (86). There is, accordingly, an inherent *generality* at work in our engagement with things: such engagement essentially positions us within a broader field that reaches beyond the here and now. The familiar world is the prior unity in terms of which any concrete context of significance finds its place.

An analogous structure can be seen in Heidegger's account of our being-with. Other people are encountered first and foremost in concrete contexts of everyday significance. They are encountered in terms of what they *do*, or what they are called upon to do, within such contexts. We might call this one's "social role." To comport toward another person in a particular context of significance – that is, with understanding – is to appreciate what the other is doing as more or less the kind of thing she *would* do, given her role, in other contexts of significance in which her respective role finds its place. Our engagement with others, our "being-with" them, thus always already involves an orientation beyond the particular context at hand, toward other contexts, thanks to our comprehending participation in a wider social practice. Once again, we see the inherent generality at work in our situational engagement with entities (here, others) in a particular context. For who others are, including who oneself is, is first and foremost a matter of rendering concrete, by participating in, a social practice. A social practice – more or less what Heidegger characterizes as "the ANYONE" (*das Man*) – is the prior whole in terms of which others, including oneself, make sense.

No matter the entity, and whatever the style of comportment, to engage with entities understandingly is to be oriented with a wider whole of possibilities in terms of which those entities make SENSE. An everyday situation is thus characterized as a "general situation" (*allgemeine Lage*, SZ 300) by Heidegger precisely to register the sense of generality at work in our absorbed engagement within it. A situation is general *not* because it is not particular or concrete. It is general because the particular situation is essentially integrated with and opens out onto a wider setting of more such situations within a form of life. An everyday context exists essentially in such a way as to lead to *more* of them. The one situation (yet another faculty meeting) ushers in another (a seminar) in more or less familiar ways as one lives out a way to be (being a teacher). So we should hear the modifier "general" in "general situation" along the lines of ordinary, humdrum, or, to use Heidegger's preferred term, *average* (see AVERAGENESS). Any such average situation, to be sure, is a particular set of circumstances that affords its own unique and fine-grained nuance. But it is, more fundamentally, a recognizable *excerpt* of how things generally stand within an ongoing form of life, the basic terms of which are framed in advance by one's orientation in the wider space of intelligible possibilities characteristic of familiarity with that form of life.

Consider as a rough analogy the parts of SPACE within the whole of space that Kant describes in the *Critique of Pure Reason*. As Heidegger explains in his lectures on that book delivered shortly after the publication of *Being and Time*, space as a *unitary* whole is not a result of adding together determinate regions of space, for regions of space are not independent components that could exist by themselves. Rather, any region of space is only possible as part of the prior whole of space. A region of space is thus a "delimitation," as Kant puts it, of the whole of space. Compare the generality of an everyday situation. An everyday situation essentially finds its place within the whole of an ongoing form of life. And like the way a determinate region of space opens out onto more space, the average everyday situation opens out onto more everyday situations. An everyday situation, akin to a determinate region of space, is a part of a whole that cannot be understood or identified independently of that whole. One might therefore call an everyday situation a "delimitation" of a form of life.

Public practices, including of course LANGUAGE, serve as reservoirs of intelligibility funding engagement in general situations. As Heidegger says, "the anyone prescribes that way of interpreting the world and BEING-IN-THE-WORLD which lies closest" (SZ 127). The self that comports toward entities in the everyday mode is titled the "anyone-self" (*Man-selbst*). The anyone-self engages in general situations, maintaining itself in the "public interpretedness" afforded by the public practice into which one has been inducted.

Before turning to the contrasting existential situation, two crucial features of this everyday sense-making practice at work in general situations are worth noting. First, the anyone-self is dispersed into the objects of concern that articulate general situations. By this, Heidegger means that in everyday comportment toward entities, as we are "on our way," we are occupied by what needs taking care of in the here and now and not by the wider space of possibilities in terms of which entities make sense. This is obviously a matter of course. After all, one's comportment toward entities as entities is enabled by the understanding of their possibilities. Public practice is a reservoir of this understanding: thanks to one's induction into public practice, one finds oneself going about one's business in the relatively fluid manner characteristic of day-to-day life (at least for the most part). There is nothing therefore more natural than relying on that understanding as we make our way about general situations. In its everyday functioning, then, familiarity with the world operates in the background, making "dispersed"

situational engagement possible in the self-effacing manner appropriate to its role. Such familiarity is drawn upon rather than at stake. There is, as Heidegger remarks, a kind of security and comfort in this (SZ 384).

Second, and consequently, we are, as individuals, disburdened by our dispersal into the everyday world. Heidegger characterizes this tendency as "depriving the particular Dasein of its answerability" (SZ 127). By this, he means that in the everyday mode of sense making, we take for granted the basic possibilities in terms of which entities, within general situations, present themselves (SZ 294). That is, we navigate these situations as though intelligibility is taken care of by the public practice into which we have been inducted, "supplied," independently of one's participation in that practice. As Heidegger puts it, Dasein, as the anyone-self, gets "lived by" public practice (SZ 299). Such is the "irresoluteness" of the anyone-self in its "submission" to general situations. The anyone-self, in another formulation, "lives along abandoning oneself to one's THROWNNESS" (SZ 345).

The existential situation (*Situation*), by contrast, is one in which we are called upon to take over one's thrownness rather than be taken along by it. As such, the situation demands the resolute stance of the owned self in contrast to the irresolute "fallen" stance of the anyone-self immersed in general situations. Heidegger makes clear in multiple passages that the existential situation, which he also dubs the "limit-situation" (*Grenzsituation*) is intimately linked to the anxious anticipation of DEATH. For, an existential situation is one in which the fate of a whole form of life, the understanding of being it embodies, hangs in the balance; the limitedness of one's form of life has come to a head.

As Heidegger puts it:

> We have defined resoluteness … as a projecting which is reticent and ready for ANXIETY. RESOLUTENESS gains its AUTHENTICITY as anticipatory resoluteness. In this, Dasein understands itself with regard to its ABILITY-TO-BE, and it does so in such a manner that it will go right under the eyes of death in order thus to take over in its thrownness that entity which it itself is, and to take it over as a whole. The resolute taking over of one's factical there, means, at the same time, that the existential situation is one which has been resolved upon. (SZ 282)

The TEMPORALITY of the existential situation is marked by the "MOMENT" (*Augenblick*) in contrast to the "present" of the general situation:

> [As] something which has been thrown into the world, Dasein loses itself in the "world" in its factical submission to that with which it is to concern itself. The present, which makes up the existential meaning of "getting taken along" … gets brought back from its lostness by a resolution, so that the current situation and thus primordial "limit situation" of being-toward-death, will be disclosed as a moment which has been held onto. (SZ 348)

Take the following example as an illustration of the phenomenon Heidegger is trying to identify. In Kuhn's discussion of what is known as the "chemical revolution," he describes the context of the discovery of oxygen announced in Lavoisier's 1777 papers. These papers were the beginning of an extended episode that eventually ushered in the oxygen theory of combustion in place of the now-obsolete phlogiston theory. Lavoisier had apparently expressed anxiety about the phlogiston theory as early as 1772, depositing a sealed note with the Secretary of the

French Academy. But by 1777, partly due to Joseph Priestley's experiments, this sense that something was awry had grown into the recognition that, in Kuhn's terms, a major paradigm shift might very well be necessary – a recognition Priestley resisted to the end of his life. Where Lavoisier saw oxygen, Priestley saw dephlogisticated air. Given the fundamental role these purported items had in shaping the field of possibilities for chemical entities as such, Kuhn famously urged us to acknowledge that, after discovering oxygen, Lavoisier "worked in a different world."

The situation facing Lavoisier was an existential situation. It does not matter that Lavoisier turned out to be right (as far as we know). And it does not matter that the situation was scientific. What matters is the peculiar possibility of a *concrete situation within a form of life that comes to contain the whole of that form of life*. A general situation, recall, is a "delimitation" of a form of life. It is one situation that leads onto others. An existential situation, while concrete, makes the whole of which it is a part an issue, as a whole – hence the peculiar sense of "fulness" of the existential situation: a whole, paradoxically, comes to be concentrated into one of its parts. An existential situation puts the whole at stake by making pressing the question of whether the understanding informing the form of life as a whole can be sustained. It is a situation in which the possibility of a general situation – whether this form of life can go on – is at issue. The existential situation stops one short, and calls upon one to interrogate whether the form of life at issue is sustainable. As Heidegger puts it, the anxious anticipation at work in the moment of an existential situation "brings one face to face with the possibility of REPETITION (*Wiederholbarkeit*)" (SZ 344). The existential situation, in short, is the finitude of death made concrete in the midst of life.

In his paper, "Could anything be more Intelligible than Everyday Intelligibility? Reinterpreting Division I in light of Division II," Dreyfus says that Heidegger fails clearly to "distinguish two experiences of the source, nature, and intelligibility of decisive action" (Dreyfus 2017a, 38) – that, in other words, Heidegger conflates two distinct senses of the existential situation. The first experience, according to Dreyfus, is the "*primordial understanding of the current situation*" (*ibid.*). Dreyfus reads this in terms of his phenomenology of skill acquisition. The expert coper is better than merely competent because she is attuned to the distinctive character of the particular situation in all of its particularity, seizing the occasion, rather than relying on general rules and banal maxims to guide her. The second experience, according to Dreyfus, is the radical transformation described by St. Paul, Luther, and Kierkegaard, the "Christian experience of being reborn" that long interested Heidegger in the lead-up to *Being and Time*. Heidegger is indeed interested in the peculiar concreteness of the existential situation, as I have suggested above: its intensified concreteness consists in its pressing the issue of radical transformation. So understood, the existential situation is one coherent idea, not a confused conflation of two distinct ideas. The mastery that interests Heidegger is not fine-grained expert coping but rather what one might call mastery of the art of being finite. What this form of mastery involves is the burden of Division II of *Being and Time*.

Joseph K. Schear

FURTHER READING

Dreyfus 2017a, 27–44, Haugeland 2013, Kuhn 1962, Schear 2013a

187.
SOJOURN (*AUFENTHALT*)

"SOJOURN" CONNOTES "the abode," "residence," or "stay" of the human being upon the EARTH. In Heidegger's work of the 1940s–1950s it comes to function as the way to characterize human existence as such; that is, "the DWELLING of the human being, its sojourn in the midst of entities as a whole" (GA55:214). As with so many of Heidegger's word-plays, the German term for sojourn – *Aufenthalt* – belongs together with other words that share the common stem *halten* (to hold), such as "stance" (*Haltung*), "RESTRAINT" (*Verhaltenheit*), "withholding" (*Vorenthalt*), and "relation" (*Verhältnis*). Perhaps the locus classicus for such an analysis lies in Heidegger's discussion of "originary ethics" in the "Letter on 'Humanism,'" where he understands the Greek notion of *ethos*, not in terms of traditional ethics, but as the "sojourn [*Aufenthalt*], dwelling place ... that names the open region in which the human being dwells" (GA9:354/269). In 1946 Heidegger attempts to deconstruct the metaphysical discourse of ethics as a code of conduct, a set of moral principles, a socially directed legislation of behavioral norms back to the way Dasein holds itself (*hält sich*) in a certain relation (*Verhältnis*) to the world. This, for Heidegger, remains the basis for any possible thinking of human dwelling as something other than mere ethics or a discipline rooted in anthropological subjectivity or "humanism." Instead, Heidegger will think human dwelling as *ethos* or sojourn, a stance or comportment (*Haltung*) marked by restraint or reserve (*Verhaltenheit*), and an abstinence or forbearance (*Sichenthalten*). Here, Heidegger renames Dasein as sojourn, and thereby rethinks the image of the Cartesian subject as master and possessor of the world and instead points to the human capacity for letting go and RELEASEMENT as ways of abandoning presence for an attunement to the absential. Within the later Heidegger's work, this emphasis on "restraint" (*Zurückhaltung*), "holding back" (*enthalten*), "reticence" (*Stille halten*), and letting go becomes another way of finding the genuine and proper comportment for the human being as it attempts to think "the truth of being."

Going back to its roots in the German verb *halten* ("to hold," "to retain," "to keep,"), sojourn (*Aufenthalt*) connotes an abiding, or residence in an abode. It remains bound to an originary sense of the human being holding itself up (*sich aufhalten*), i.e., staying, residing, LINGERING, abiding amidst entities. This relationship (*Verhältnis*) to things is not pre-eminently a spatial one; it also expresses a temporal form of dwelling as a remaining with and near entities, a "pausing" (*Stillhalten*) that holds to silence in a steadfast kind of dwelling, even amidst the furious changes that occur in the world of the "ANYONE." Sojourn designates the site where the human being is held up for a while and in this whiling-abiding-staying is exposed to the self-manifestating and self-withholding of being in and as temporal movement. To grasp all of these variations on the root stem *halten* and its etymological unfolding in the terms *Haltung*, *Verhaltenheit*, and *Vorenthalt* is to attune ourselves to Heidegger's rhetorical practice of paronomasia: the deployment of word roots and stems in a variety of grammatical inflections that sets stem and prefix into a kind of tension that releases possibilities of meaning concealed in the root. If in the post-war era sojourn will come to function as another way for Heidegger to

express the human situation, much as Dasein did in the 1920s, we should not see this solely as a preoccupation of the later Heidegger. In *Being and Time* Heidegger reads Dasein as caught up in the present moment, "tangled up in itself," where its "dispersed not-lingering turns into an *inability to abide anywhere* [*Aufenthaltslosigkeit*]" (SZ 347). But even earlier, in texts such as *Ontology: The Hermeneutics of Facticity* (SS 1923), Heidegger writes of Dasein's dispersion in the tranquilized world of the anyone-self, which he sees as "an abode-less tarrying that never halts nor makes a sojourn [*das aufenthaltlose Verweilen*] and yet it holds itself and sojourns in what it goes back to" (GA63:54/43). At the same time, he defines philosophy as "a definite kind of sojourning at home in" (*Aufthalten bei*) where "the most important task is: precisely winning a genuine sojourn, and not just any kind – the sojourn before the possibility of leaping into the work of worried decision" (GA63:108–09/84). Moreover, in his WS 1924–25 lectures, *Plato's Sophist*, he offers an interpretation of *logos* as "place of the sojourn of being-in" (*Aufenthaltsort des In-seins*).

This sense of language as our proper home, the dwelling place wherein we come to hold ourselves in a stance that is our *ethos*, will also be explored in Heidegger's Aristotle lectures of SS 1924. There Heidegger understands abiding or sojourning as "being-in precisely the there of living [*das Da von Leben*]" where "'In' = 'abiding with' [*aufhalten bei*]" (GA18:381/258) in such a way that he comes to identify *ethos* with a stance or comportment (*Haltung*) (GA18:68, 106/48, 73). From these early lectures of the 1920s there emerge two crucial themes that will come to shape Heidegger's entire thought path: first, that the fundamental stance (*Haltung*) of the human being, its *ethos*, is nothing that is "moral" but, rather, has to do with the way the human being maintains itself, holds itself open (*hält sich auf*) for the truth of being. Second, this *ethos*, the very comportment of the human being, its way of abiding, residing, dwelling in the world, is intimately connected with language (GA18:64/46). Indeed, Heidegger goes on to claim that unlike ethics, which gets caught up in subjective "consequences and intentions," *ethos* signifies nothing less than "the being of the human being," which "means comportment [*Haltung*] as the proper or authentic way of being" (GA19:178/123, 131/90). In other words, drawing on Aristotle's notion of *ethos* – which usually gets translated as the "character" or "disposition" of a person – Heidegger focuses on "the comportment [*Haltung*] of the human being, how the human being is there [*da*], how it offers itself as a human being, how it appears in being-with-one-another" (GA18:106/73). This understanding of human being in terms of stance, comportment, and sojourn situates it in a non-moral, non-psychological register within a shared world of belonging to both community and language. Early on in his career, Heidegger understood ethics as intimately bound up with what Aristotle termed "rhetoric." Rhetoric in this sense involves becoming attuned to the unique, ever-changing temporal contexts/moods that shape our understanding of language in its practical, concrete situatedness in the world. Rhetoric speaks to these moods, highlighting their kairological significance and rooting speech in the habits, familiar practices, and ways of dwelling that constitute our world. Here Heidegger comes to understand language as intimately bound up with our *ethos*, our habitual haunts (*ethea*) and ways of abiding in the abode granted to us in our dwelling. For him, language is the genuine abode (*ethos*) of human beings, the place where we belong and that we share with other entities. In this way, language forms our very sense of community and of our belonging to a specific PEOPLE in a particular historical epoch, situating us in terms of that people's historical destiny.

In his Rectoral Address of 1933 Heidegger will sing the refrain that "we need to stand firm [*standhalten*] in the extreme distress of German fate," unsheltered against the storm that besets

all questioning humans, confronting the uncertainty at the heart of being, and through this resolve "to persevere in the face of what is." Such a stance of standing firm exposes us to the necessity of questioning that forces us to confront the tragic dimension of existence that is, Heidegger stresses, "inescapable" (GA16:108–12/HR 109–12). Yet during the years of Heidegger's political engagement, the explicit discourse about *ethos* in its relation to sojourn, stance, and restraint goes underground as it were. It re-emerges, however, in two key texts from the war years, *Basic Concepts* (1941) and the Heraclitus lectures (1943–44), where Heidegger will rethink the question of what it means to be "human" in terms of our *Aufenthalt* (sojourn/abode) upon the earth. The human being, Heidegger claims, "stands in an abode [*Aufenthalt*] laid out by being itself," but one that is covered over and concealed (GA51:85/71). Only through "the meditation [*Besinnung*] upon the first beginning of Western thinking," only by attuning ourselves to the "hints" (*Winke*) provided by language can we enter into "the essential primordiality of our historical human essence" (GA51:89/75). In the Heraclitus lectures of SS 1944, Heidegger makes an explicit connection between sojourn and the problem of "ethics," now rethought as *ethos*, identified "not with 'moral bearing' [*sittliche Haltung*] but with sojourning [*Aufenthalt*] in the sense of dwelling in the midst of entities" (GA55:349). Here Heidegger emphasizes that this "residing" (*Sichaufhalten*) in the midst of entities in their totality "is the way that the human being abides with entities [*sich an das Seiende hält*] and thereby maintains [*sich behält*] and holds itself [*sich behält*] and lets itself be held [*sich halten lässt*]" (GA55:206). In these lectures, "ethics" ceases to be a set of rules for conduct or behavior; instead, the whole discourse of ethics will be reinterpreted as *ethos*, so that Heidegger can claim: "the human being is that living being about whom what is most proper and distinguishing is *ethos*" (GA55:217). What Heidegger will emphasize here is the relation of human being to entities as a whole, a relation shaped by *ethos*, the way we dwell, abide, and stay with other entities – especially other human beings. Where Western metaphysics has long distinguished human being from other entities through its possession of *logos* – Aristotle's classic definition of the human being as the animal who has speech/thought/reason – Heidegger will focus on the inner dynamic between human dwelling amidst entities in the way the human being is held up, held apart, held back, held forth, and held open by the truth of being.

At root what Heidegger puts forward here is less a description of human dwelling as abiding, residing, etc., than it is a call and a critique: a call for a more rooted and primordial way of dwelling in nearness to being, and the critique of the average, inauthentic way that humans dwell without attuning themselves to this hidden, primordial bond. At the basis of this call and critique is a reading of the human being as that being who is a stranger to itself, a figure who is unsettled even – and perhaps most especially – in the settlements that comprise its dwelling place. In his "Ister" lectures of SS 1942, Heidegger draws upon the *Antigone* texts of Sophocles to give word to this "counter turning" essence of human dwelling: "venturing forth in all directions, human beings arrive everywhere and yet everywhere come to nothing, insofar as what they attain in venturing forth is never sufficient to fulfill and sustain their essence" (GA53:104/84). In other words, the human sojourn upon the earth is marked by a tragic reversal in that "whatever human beings undertake turns in itself ... counter to what humans fundamentally seek from it, namely: becoming homely in the midst of entities." In the "Ister" lectures, through his readings of Sophocles and Hölderlin, Heidegger will uncover a poetic language that offers hints for helping "human beings find their way to their abode in the truth of being" (GA9:361/274).

In the "Letter on 'Humanism,'" Heidegger goes on to explain what "abode" means by parsing a fragment from Heraclitus:

> The saying of Heraclitus (Fragment 119) goes: *ethos anthropoi daimon*. This is usually translated, "A man's character is his *daimon*." This translation thinks in a modern way, not a Greek one. *Ethos* means abode, dwelling place. The word names the open region in which the human being dwells. The open region of his abode allows what pertains to the essence of the human being, and what in thus arriving resides in nearness to him, to appear. The abode of the human being contains and preserves the advent of what belongs to the human being in its essence. (GA9:354–55/269)

For the late Heidegger it is above all poetry that brings to language this gift of dwelling in that it lets humans be open to the claim (*Anspruch*) that sounds in poetic language (*Sprache*). This opening up to the claim of language upon us does not require any technical skill in following the bends and turns of poetic diction. It involves, rather, a comportment (*Verhalten*) that, as sojourn (*Aufenthalt*), remains attuned to being's own way of holding itself in reserve (*aufbehalten*), of with-holding itself (*ent-halten*), and maintaining itself in what is withheld (*vorenthalten*). Such a stance (*Haltung*) demands restraint (*Verhaltenheit*) on the part of human beings who wish to abide (*sich aufhalten*) in the event of being that opens to poetic dwelling. The task of thinking in the time "between the times" of the gods' withdrawal and their return calls for an awakening to the resonant power of Hölderlin's poetic word. This word "calls out in the turning of time," turning us toward our proper task of making ready for a new advent by "preparing a sojourn in nearness to the gods" (GA4:197/226, 195/224). Everything depends upon this alone: that in hearkening to the words of the poet we come to find a dwelling place, an abode or *ethos*, that co-responds to the *ethos* of being. This is Heidegger's radical, revolutionary insight: that ethics, as it is currently constituted, is metaphysically bankrupt and that what is called for is a new *ethos* of the ethical, rooted not in human values or measures, but in the more originary *ethos* of poetic dwelling in the nearness of being. It is this promise of an "originary ethics" (GA9:356/271) that lies at the very heart of Heidegger's work, even as such a promise is marked by the restraint of a thinker who holds himself back from proposing any concrete or applied rules of behavior for ethical life. This restraint allows for the possibility that we might remain open for the mystery that bespeaks "the withholding of the sacred" (*der Vorenthalt des Heiligen*) that marks our age as one of destitution and lack (GA13:232). It is in this gesture toward the space of beyng's withdrawal, an attunement toward its concealed/forgotten/abyssal absence, that Heidegger locates the proper *ethos* of human dwelling as one of sacred mourning for the gods' departure. Yet in this silent restraint, Heidegger also finds the opening for the possibility of the gods' return. No human strategy can engineer this return, but in the *ethos* of restrained letting be the human being opens itself to this possibility. It is in terms of this dynamic that we can understand Heidegger's translation of Heraclitus' Fragment 119 as: "The (familiar) sojourn [*der (geheure) Aufenthalt*] for humans is the open region for the presencing of God (the unfamiliar one) [*des Un-geheuren*]" (GA9:356/271). If the human sojourn upon the earth is one of a restrained stance, then such a stance must allow for a comportment of poetic dwelling.

In an epoch of nihilistic destitution and homelessness, the danger persists that the possibility of genuine dwelling is denied to us, that "through their incessant activity (*Unaufhaltsames*), modern technology, together with the scientific industrialization of the world, sets about to obliterate every possibility of sojourning" (GA75:244). Yet Heidegger remained hopeful that

the power of commemorative thinking would grant a poetic sojourn to those who attune themselves to the mystery of the question posed by the poetic word. By remaining with this question in all its questionability and by preparing ourselves for a way out of the darkness of the world's night, Heidegger trusted that we might "still be vouchsafed another sojourn in the homeland" (GA75:235). In this non-moral stance of rethinking the *ethos* of human dwelling, Heidegger points us toward "the sojourn of enduring the question [*der Aufenthalt des Aufhaltens der Frage*] in the way Hölderlin draws it" (GA75:245). This would be a theme that Heidegger would sound down through his work in the 1960s and 1970s, as he came to terms with his reading of human existence as a fourfold gathering that brings out the "mirror-play" of ex- and AD-APTATION or ap-propriation (*Ent- und Er-eignis*) (GA75:19/PLT 178). Mortal dwelling will be thought of here as "a sojourn with things," where dwelling preserves, shelters, guards, and cares for the intricate balance of the fourfold within which humans find their proper place. This sheltering gesture provides no foundation; indeed, it is always provisional, always attentive to the specific temporal situation and context within and out of which it emerges. Thinking here does not strive to offer philosophical "truths," but remains ever attuned to the fourfold play of concealment/revelation that essentially prevails in all coming to presence. Heidegger remains mindful of the way humans dwell upon the earth, their stance in their sojourn, until the very end of his life. In one of his last written statements he sends a letter to the Heidegger Circle meeting in Chicago in 1976, exhorting his readers to reflect upon the charge of thinking with him what remains still unthought in the play between the first and the other beginning:

> To think what properly characterizes *alêtheia* as such, whose legacy from the beginning of the history of being, has remained necessarily unthought in and for this beginning, and through such thinking to prepare the possibility of a transformed human sojourn within the world [*Weltaufenthalt*]. (GA16:748/2)

<div align="right">*Charles Bambach*</div>

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Aufenthalt SZ 61, 347; GA16:537, 715–17; GA18:355, 381; GA20:213; GA51:81–83; GA53:91,107–08; GA54:205–06; GA75:233–45; GA77:181–85
Haltung GA9:104–06/83–84; GA18:68, 106, 120, 163; GA19:638–40; GA45:50–51
Vorenthalt GA9:382/289; GA13:232–35; GA16:719; GA71:122

FURTHER READING

Aurenque 2011, Bambach 2013, McNeill 2006, Schmidt 2001

<div align="center">

SOJOURN(ING) (*AUFHALTEN*). SEE SOJOURN.

SOLICITUDE (*SORGE*). SEE CARE.

</div>

188.
SPACE (*RAUM*)

Raum denotes a kind of lived space, an open region of differentially near and far places and paths anchored in entities. Despite the term's relative rareness in Heidegger's opus, what it picks out is a key dimension of both human existence (*Existenz*, *Da-sein*) and the clearing (*Lichtung*) of being (*Sein*). As Heidegger's philosophy evolved, the basic features of this dimension remained the same even as the dimension itself assumed a transformed role in his thought.

Space as a dimension of existence and the clearing must be distinguished from the space of extended objects or events, the space of nature. Examples of the latter are the spatial arrangement of stars in a galaxy, the spatial distribution of football players on a field, the geographical distribution of high school commencement ceremonies, and, more generally, three-dimensional Euclidean space with its perpendicular axis coordinate system. The space of extended objects and events is studied in physics, architecture, and mathematics, and it has been famously analyzed as absolute, relational, or relative. Heidegger sometimes distinguished this sort of space from the sort that is a dimension of existence and the clearing by describing it as space in the singular (*der Raum*) as opposed to spaces in the plural (*Räume*).

Spaces of existence are something human. They are a kind of lived space: spaces of lived experience in Heidegger's earlier work and spaces people live through in later work. They can also be understood as spaces of activity since they represent the pertinence of the arrangements of entities amid which people proceed to these people's ongoing activities.

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger used the word "spatiality" (*Räumlichkeit*) to denote the space of existence and to contrast this space with the homogeneous space of objects and events. This book famously analyzes human existence as being-in-the-world. The world, formally defined, is that "wherein [a person] as such can be said to 'live'" (SZ 65). Examples of worlds are the world at work, the world at home, and the world of the subway. Because the world is that wherein people live, Heidegger also described it as the *Umwelt*, literally, the world around: it is composed of the entities amid, with, and toward which a person proceeds. Spatiality is the aroundness of the world, the round-about-actors of the entities amid, with, and toward which they act. An example is the round-about-her-ness of the entities in a kitchen as someone cooks there.

Heidegger identified two pairs of fundamental properties of this spatiality: nearness (*Nähe*) and farness (*Ferne*), which are coordinated with dis-stance (*Ent-fernung*), and place/region (*Platz/Gegend*), which are coordinated with orientation (*Ausrichtung*). Nearness and farness are the nearness and farness of entities in the world. Entities are near or far according to whether they are involved or not involved in, or attended or not attended to, in the activities that take place in that world. A knife, for instance, is near while someone cuts onions but might be far when people are eating dinner. Dis-stance, meanwhile, is entities being brought near or made far in the activities that take place in a world. The onion-cutter, for instance, brings the knife

close in cutting and makes it far in going to the table and eating. To be an entity in a world is to be far from and near to, and to be brought far and near in, what people do there.

The place of an entity is its place in, where it fits into, the activities that happen in a given world. Its place is thus defined by how it is used, how people are directed toward it, and what people do at it; these actions also make up the orientation of the spatiality of being-in-the-world. A fence, for instance, is a place to stand and watch a horse, a place to turn back, a place to hang a banner, and so forth. This is how it fits into human activities. All entities in a given world have and anchor place(s). The places of the entities in a given world also interrelate. Indeed, places and entities form wholes called regions. Finally, the places involved in a region devolve from the activities that are performed there amid the entities involved. For example, the surfaces, shelves, pots, utensils, foodstuffs, and appliances in a kitchen have interrelated places as defined by the actions people perform there. The so emplaced entities thereby make up a region.

In sum, spatiality is composed of regions of interrelatedly placed equipment differentially nearing and far-ing in people's activities amid them. In existing, a person always lets both entities and herself into space (*einräumen, sich einräumen*) by disclosing regions, in which she proceeds.

Heidegger held that spatiality is more fundamental in human life than space is. At a minimum, people firstly and mostly encounter entities in their near or far regional placement, not in their objective spatial positions. The knife, for instance, is firstly and mostly encountered as involved or not involved in what one is doing, not as lying at determinate measurable distances from, and occupying definite plottable locations among, the spoon, the bread, the burner, and so on. Heidegger also believed that the spatiality of existence grounds the discovery of space in the sense that space and the spatial properties of objects are encountered only when entities are no longer encountered as regionally placed. What's more, even though, when encountered, the space of nature shows itself as having been there all along as people proceeded about their business (the cook was busy using entities and not attending to their spatial arrangement), this space – pace the modern philosophical tradition – cannot account for existential spatiality.

The nears and fars (and places) of entities in a world can vary. The range of variation of their nears and fars in the activities that happen there is called "leeway" (*Spielraum*). As a person goes about her business in the kitchen, the different entities there come nearer and recede farther with the different actions that she and others perform there. Leeway is the range of possible nears and fars of these entities. This range is delimited by social norms (*das Man*, see the ANYONE). Human existence is such that it always makes room for (*einräumt*) such a leeway. A parallel notion of leeway (*Spielraum, Zeitspielraum*) reappears in works after *Being and Time*, for instance, in the essay "On the Origin of the Work of Art" (GA5) where it denotes the leeway, the range of variation, for living in the world (now understood as opening up between EARTH and sky).

In the 1930s, Heidegger introduced a term, "space-time" (*Raum-Zeit*), that is absent in *Being and Time*. *Being and Time* analyzes spatiality as a mode of a type of TIME, TEMPORALITY (*Zeitlichkeit*), that uniquely characterizes human life. That book also claims that temporality is a kind of OPEN and that human existence, because it is temporal, has a special connection to the clearing, the THERE (*Da*). The clearing or there is the open realm in which anything that is exists and shows up. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger thought that the open that belongs to human

existence, namely, temporality, is also the open that belongs to the clearing. As a result, human existence and the clearing coincide: the clearing *is* human temporality. In the posthumously published *Contributions to Philosophy* (GA65) from the mid-1930s, Heidegger held that space-time is a kind of open. Like temporality in *Being and Time*, moreover, it is at once the open of human life and the open belonging to the clearing. Beginning in the 1930s, however, Heidegger held that the clearing is distinct from human life. Accordingly, space-time is no longer that feature of human existence by virtue of which existence coincides with the clearing, but that feature of human life by virtue of which it *stands into* the event or ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*) of the clearing. This adaptation is distinct from humanity but cannot happen without humanity standing into it. As a feature of the clearing, space-time is the "first clearing of the open as the empty" (GA65:265). Space is the site (*Stätte*), the surrounding hold (*berückend Umhalt*), which embraces everything that is, including humans. As a feature of human life, meanwhile, space – the site – is where humans dwell (see below).

In the 1930s and early 1940s, Heidegger conceptualized the humanity that stands into the clearing and without whose standing-into the clearing would not happen, as peoples (*Völker*). Space-time, accordingly is a feature of a PEOPLE: the open of the clearing where a people dwells. It follows that there are as many space-times as there are peoples. After World War II, Heidegger thought that the humanity that stands into the clearing is, not peoples, but HUMAN BEINGS (*Menschen*) or mortals (*Sterblichen*). The number of space-times now depends on the number of things (see below).

In a late lecture, "Time and Being" (GA14), Heidegger characterized time-space (versus space-time) as the breadth of time, as the expanse opened up between past, present, and future. Although this formulation might seem to resuscitate the subordination of space to time found in *Being and Time* and abandoned in the *Contributions*, it actually attributes a spatial unity to the three dimensions of time. In that lecture, moreover, Heidegger mentioned the need for an analysis of space that relates space to adaptation (*Ereignis*), referring the reader to the famous early 1950s essay, "Building Dwelling Thinking" (GA7/PLT). This essay is the only place where Heidegger fills in the exceptionally abstract analysis of space found in the *Contributions*.

In this essay, the analysis of spatiality found in *Being and Time* reappears in the context of Heidegger's post-early-1930s understanding of the relationship between humanity and the clearing. The clearing is now understood to happen at things, which thereby qualify as places (*Orte*). Heidegger's examples of things include a work of art, a river, a jug, and a bridge. A clearing happens at a THING because a thing institutes a site (*Stätte*) for the FOURFOLD (humans, divinities, earth, and sky), whose interplay is central to the clearing, on Heidegger's analysis of it in the 1950s. A thing, furthermore, institutes a site by making room for (*einräumen*) the fourfold, that is, by granting a space (*einräumen*) into which mortals, divinities, earth, and sky are admitted. This space (in conjunction with time) is the empty open of the clearing. It is also a space of mortal DWELLING. For the clearing cannot happen without mortals standing into it, and dwelling is how they do so. The space that belongs to the clearing into which the fourfold is admitted is also the space of that mortal dwelling, the happening of which admits the fourfold in its interplay.

This space of dwelling, like spatiality in *Being and Time*, is composed of regionalized places and paths. But whereas in *Being and Time* regions are distributed around activities, in the later essay they are centered on things. In Heidegger's memorable example (GA7:152–53/PLT 158–59), an array of places and paths to walk, to fish, to seek shade, and to travel to town,

etc., is centered on a bridge, not on the activities that occur in its midst. It is the thing that makes room for (*einräumen*) space, whereas in *Being and Time* it is people who let entities and themselves into spatiality (*sich einräumen*). Thing-centered regions of places and paths are also no longer spatialities of lived experience but spaces (*Räume*) that people go through daily. They are distinct from, though not independent of, human experience and activity.

Thing-centered regions of places and paths, the spaces of human dwelling, are also the space, that is, the site into which the fourfold are admitted. These regions are thus the spatial dimension of the open of the clearing, the site invoked in the *Contributions*' abstract analysis of space-time. By dwelling in such regions humans stand into the clearing.

Throughout his career, Heidegger envisioned human life as proceeding in a space. The connection of this space to the clearing of being gradually emerged as his career proceeded.

Theodore Schatzki

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA2:102–14, 367–69; GA7:145–64/PLT 145–61; GA13:203–10; GA14:3–30; GA20:229–31, 306–25; GA53:23–24, 35–50, 55–59; GA65:189, 191–93, 371–88; GA89:383–84, 401–03, 411–13, 416–33

FURTHER READING

Malpas 2006, Schatzki 2007, Villel-Petit 1996

189.
SPIRIT (*GEIST*)

S PIRIT FOR HEIDEGGER denotes our capacity as humans to understand BEING and inquire about the SENSE of being. The German word for spirit, *Geist*, can also be translated into English as "mind," and is a term of art for a number of prominent German thinkers, including Hegel, Schelling, Hölderlin, and Husserl. Heidegger was interested in and influenced by the idea of Spirit in these other thinkers, especially Hegel, and discusses their use of the term in many of his lecture courses. However, he does not fully develop his own technical sense of the word until the mid-1930s, in the infamous Rectoral Address and the *Introduction to Metaphysics* lecture course (GA40).

The first substantial discussions of *Geist* in Heidegger's corpus are critiques of the role it plays in Husserl's ontology. While Husserl, especially in *Ideas II*, views spirit as an ontological category that social phenomena belong to, Heidegger thinks that such a category fails to capture the relations of CARE (*Sorge*) that constitute our involvement with the WORLD. Husserl's conception of spirit thus signifies a commitment to the sort of OCCURRENT (*vorhanden*) ONTOLOGY that plagued Descartes. In *Being and Time*, Heidegger indirectly references spirit in Husserl when talking about DASEIN's spatiality. He shows a particular aversion to views of spatiality as consisting in the "being-occurrent-together of some . . . spiritual thing along with a corporeal thing" (SZ 82).

Hegel's use of *Geist* is also of interest to Heidegger, especially in *Being and Time*, where he draws attention to the connection Hegel posits between TIME (*Zeit*) and spirit in the *Phenomenology of Spirit*. Hegel claims that spirit "falls into time" because both spirit and time exhibit the same ontological structure when viewed under the lens of his dialectical logic. As a result, time "simply gets contrasted with spirit . . . as something that is occurrent" (SZ 435). This conception of time's relation to spirit, however, misses out on the sense in which our EXISTENCE (*Existenz*), the way in which we "are," both determines and is determined by our relation to time. According to Heidegger, we must view time as intimately bound up with our concernful relations to our selves and to the projects we hope to carry out. Thus, "'Spirit' does not fall *into* time; but factical existence 'falls' as falling *from* primordial, authentic TEMPORALITY" (SZ 436).

The resemblance Heidegger sees between spirit in Hegel and his own conception of Dasein arguably informs his technical use of spirit. Heidegger states in *Introduction to Metaphysics* that his preferred definition of spirit comes from the Rectoral Address of 1933, where he claims that "spirit is primordially attuned, knowing RESOLUTENESS toward the essence of being" (GA40:53/52). This is remarkably similar to his definition of Dasein as the entity for which "in its very being, that being is an issue for it" (SZ 12). We might, however, distinguish spirit from Dasein by noting that spirit displays both attunement (*Gestimmtheit*) and resoluteness (*Entschlossenheit*) toward being. These are success words for Heidegger and imply that Dasein genuinely exhibits spirit only when it fully endorses its position as an entity that can inquire about the nature of being. For Heidegger, asking the question of being is "one of the essential fundamental conditions for awakening the spirit" (GA40:53/52) and once spirit has been awakened, "entities as such and in each case come more into being" (GA40:53/52).

Heidegger cites the awakening of spirit by asking the question of being as a condition for "taking over the historical mission of the world, and thus for taking over the historical mission of our PEOPLE, the people of the center of the West" (GA40:53/52) and claims that Greek is, along with German, "at once the most powerful and the most spiritual of languages" (GA40:61/60). How are we to make sense of the problematic connection Heidegger draws between asking the question of being and German cultural superiority? One thing to remember is that in the German philosophical tradition, spirit normally signifies some kind of intersubjective awareness endemic to the sphere of culture. By linking spirit to sensitivity to the question of being and invoking spirit in his most overtly political lectures, Heidegger might be attempting to relate his own philosophical project to the greater German tradition, in service to what he took to be a promising mobilization of the German people. He also might be trying to demonstrate how some of the general Nazi policies he initially endorsed (especially what he calls the "knowledge service") tap in to broader philosophical concerns. Whatever the case, it is deeply troubling for Heidegger to link the question of being to stated Nazi political objectives.

Heidegger's last significant meditation on the meaning of spirit comes in his 1942 lecture course on "The Ister" by Hölderlin (GA53), although his 1936 lecture course on Schelling's freedom-essay (GA42) also contains a substantial discussion of the word. Heidegger sees Hölderlin's conception of spirit, which is "determined in its meaning by German METAPHYSICS yet . . . not identical with what this metaphysics thinks" (GA53:158), as close to his own and uses Hölderlin's reference to "thoughts of communal spirit" as a jumping-off point for his own ruminations on spirit. Most notably, Heidegger remarks that spirit "grounds the 'being at home' of human beings as historical" (GA53:161) and is revealed to us through the work of the poet, thus forming "the poetic essence of the holy, insofar as the holy brings itself to word, and as the word, speaks its claim upon human beings" (GA53:160). Here, spirit seems to take on mystical, impersonal connotations; it functions as a hidden aspect of being that governs our relation to time as historical subjects and occasionally reveals itself through the words of a thinker or poet.

The most notable secondary source on Heidegger's use of spirit is Jacques Derrida's 1987 book *Of Spirit*, which provides a detailed and nuanced analysis of Heidegger's use of the word spirit and its political connotations.

Sam Richards

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Geist in Husserl GA17:247; GA20:160–61, 171–73, 421–23
Geist in Hegel SZ 427–28, 432–36; GA32:32–36, 50–51
Geist in Schelling GA42:3–4, 243–46
Geist in Hölderlin GA53:157–64, 170–74
Geist and spatiality SZ 82, 89–90, 368
Geist and the question of being GA40:53/52; GA53:157–58
Geist, history, and culture GA40:41/40–41, 48–53/47–53, 60–61/59–60; GA53:157–64
Geist and poetry GA40:28–29/28; GA53:159–60, 173

FURTHER READING

Derrida 1989, Fryer 1996, Hegel 1977, Hoy 1989, Sinnerbrink 2008, Wood 1993

190.
STAND (*STEHEN*)

"S TAND"' CONNOTES STABLE presence, and is the root word and the core notion in a family of related concepts that Heidegger draws on frequently. The word is central to Heidegger's discussion of the HISTORY OF METAPHYSICS, often incorporated into the term denoting an EPOCH's understanding of what it means, in very general terms, to be an entity. Starting with the Greeks, metaphysical thinkers have attempted to assign entities a constant, stable meaning that can guide human predictions and MACHINATION; metaphysical thinkers make entities stand. The ancient Greeks understand entities as standing forth or rising up (*Ent-stehen*), moderns understand them as an OBJECT (*Gegenstand*) standing against a subject, and technological thinkers understand them as standing by as resources or STANDING RESERVE (*Bestand*).

In *Introduction to Metaphysics*, Heidegger inquires into the standing of being, an inquiry that eventually allows him to address the trajectory from standing forth (*Ent-stehen*) to standing reserve (*Bestand*). In asking "how does it stand with being?" (GA40:36/25), Heidegger inquires into the SENSE OF BEING, a sense that he thinks has been taken as self-evident and thus neglected. Heidegger suggests that metaphysical thinkers have taken it for granted that the being (as opposed to the non-being) of entities means their "constant [*ständig*] presence" (GA40:211/154), but that the metaphysical understanding of being has undergone significant changes over the course of history.

This HISTORY OF BEING begins with the Greeks (particularly Aristotle) who distinguish between being and non-being by linking the being of entities with their standing:

> this standing-there, this taking and maintaining a *stand* that stands erected high in itself, is what the Greeks understood as being. Whatever takes a stand becomes *constant* in itself and thereby freely and on its own runs up against the necessity of its BOUNDARY (*Grenze*), *peras.* ... For something to take such a stand therefore means for it to attain its boundary, to de-limit [*er-grenzen*] itself. Thus a basic characteristic of a being is its *telos*, which does not mean goal or purpose, but END .... "End" means completion in terms of coming to fulfillment. (GA40:64/46)

This passage brings out two important features of standing. First, an entity that comes to a stand reaches its limits; it fulfills the form that makes it the kind of being that it is. For example, a silver chalice stands when it finally reaches its completed form – when the silver is molded into the hourglass shape of a chalice, it now stands ready for use. Second, an entity that stands occupies its characteristic form constantly; it stably holds itself in this form. For example, as the silver is worked over high heat, it has not yet reached the standing of a chalice, as it is still too pliable to stably hold itself in the chalice's

characteristic form. Standing – reaching a characteristic form and remaining there constantly – represents our most basic understanding of what it is for an entity to be. Following the Greeks, metaphysical thinkers understand being as "constant [*ständig*] presence" (GA40:211/154).

However, there are developments over the course of history that represent a "decline" from the original Greek understanding (accordingly, Bambach 2003, 148–49 suggests that Heidegger draws on different derivatives of *stehen* to discuss originary Greek metaphysics – *ent-stehen* – and the "static metaphysics" that followed – *stehen, ständig, beständig*). In contrast to later metaphysical understandings of the being of entities, the ancient Greeks – who allow entities to "stand forth" – demonstrate a greater receptivity to entities, rather than an imposition of human categories onto them; entities that stand forth have "not yet been conquered in thinking" (GA40:66/47). The Greek approach to entities reveals a "struggle" to come to terms with these entities as they offer themselves, rather than taking it for granted that certain entities will be found; the Greek approach "enabl[es] the concealed to take its stand for the first time" (GA40:17/12).

In contrast to the Greeks, moderns understand entities as objects standing against a representing subject, grasped in relation to a subject's way of knowing. For example, Descartes identifies the fundamental features of an object as those of which we can be certain, like those properties that are exactly calculable. In the contemporary age of TECHNOLOGY, by contrast, entities are understood as standing reserve (*Bestand*), resources that are "brought to a stop [*zum Stehen*]" and stand by for use in human projects (GA5:288/215–16). While the moderns understood entities in terms of the representing subject's cognitive faculties, the technological being is completely subordinated to the human will; the features that once stood opposed to us are taken to be infinitely revisable and incorporable into human projects. In the age of technology, "whatever stands by in the sense of standing reserve no longer stands over against us as object" (GA7:17/QCT 17). Both objects and standing reserve lack an independent standing, leaning against the cognition or, later, the will of humans.

Heidegger makes it clear that the standing of humans is distinct from the standing of entities (see, e.g., SZ 322–23). First, humans understand (*ver-stehen*) those objects that stand; this understanding fixes them in place, making them constant (see GA40 and GA65, as well as Schalow 1992, 54–60). However, Heidegger indicates that there is more to the "standing" of humans than simply understanding the entities around us. Indeed, we are defined by our openness to being, understanding the entities around us in regard to some historical understanding of being; humans "stand in the CLEARING of being" (GA9:323/247). A major ambition of Heidegger's philosophy is to build an appreciation of our historical understanding of being, as well as our own role disclosing entities in light of this understanding. Indeed, Heidegger suggests that such an appreciation determines "whether we *stand* in history or merely stagger. Seen metaphysically, *we are staggering*. Everywhere we are underway amid entities, and yet we no longer know how it stands with being" (GA40:211/216–17). Failing to know how it stands with being – for example, by assuming its definition is self-evident – means that we are not fully standing as human beings.

Morganna Lambeth

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Aristotle and standing GA31:68–69; GA40:63–65/63–64
Standing of being GA40:36ff./35ff., 210/215–16; GA45:74–75; GA65:191–92
Standing of standing reserve GA7:17–22/QCT 16–21
Standing of *object* GA5:81/61; GA25:320–21
Standing of humans SZ 117, 303, 322–23; GA9:323/247; GA40:80–97/79–96, 211/216; GA65:259–60, 298, 303; GA70:112, 132; GA71:24, 109, 211–17

FURTHER READING

Bambach 2003, 112–79, Figal 2010a, 107–20, Rojcewicz 2006, 83–90

STANDING (*BEWANDTNIS*). SEE AFFORDANCE.

STANDING IN (*INSTÄNDIGKEIT*). SEE STEADFASTNESS.

STANDING BEFORE (*GEGENSTAND*). SEE OBJECT.

STANDING OVER AGAINST (*GEGENSTAND*). SEE OBJECT.

191.
STANDING RESERVE (*BESTAND*)

S TANDING RESERVE IS entities, the basic character of which is to stand by and be ready to be put on order, positioned to be available on demand.

The polyvalent verb *bestehen*, which underlies the noun *Bestand* (i.e., standing reserve), means to last, to endure, to persist, and so conveys a sense of permanence and duration. But Heidegger is quick to abort this direction of sense in order to redirect standing reserve toward its more concrete idiomatic senses:

> The ontological determination of standing reserve . . . is not permanence (persistent duration) but rather disposability, the constant possibility of being offered and ordered, that is, of enduring availability and accessibility. [Its constancy is not that of an object but that of a standing reserve, the constancy of always being available.] In disposability, entities are *posited* as being exclusively *available* from the ground up, accessible for use in the planning of the whole. (GA15:368/FS 62)

Concrete idiomatic examples of standing reserve include livestock, rolling stock, stock on hand, cash on hand, reserve funds, stores of goods, assets, supplies, resources. The translation of *Bestand* as "standing reserve" is quite appropriate in its application to the global economy now being developed by the modern TECHNOLOGY of the digital age. From a philosophical perspective, perhaps the most surprising consequence of *Ge-Stell*, SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT(ION)ING or placing all entities into an INVENTORY, is the emergence of the phenomenon of standing reserve and the massive storage of resources that results from it, be it energy or material goods and especially information and even human resources. Information, as it is stored in the so-called memory banks of the interneted World Wide Web, has become our most massive global standing reserve. Next comes perhaps electronic money kept liquid by global holders of reserve funds like the Federal Reserve, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund, followed by energy reserves made available by increasingly interconnected networks of power grids. Last but not least are the abundant stores of material goods distributed from gigantic warehouses like Amazon.com.

Whatever stands by as a standing reserve no longer stands over against us as an object. Thus, objectivity, the very hallmark of modern science, disappears with the development of modern technology. The more modern technology unfolds and develops, the more objectivity is transformed into orderability, disposability, availability, accessibility. This, however, does not mean that the subject–object relation itself vanishes, it rather attains its most extreme dominance, predetermined from out of syn-thetic com-positioning. The subject–object relation itself now attains, for the first time, its purely relational character, that is, its character of orderability, in which both the subject and the object are claimed as standing reserves. There are no longer any objects but only "production resources" and "consumer goods" at the disposal of everyone, who themselves are put into service in the business of production and consumption. But what does it mean for a "subject" to become a standing reserve? It amounts to

regarding human beings as resources. In universities (in this context known as "knowledge industries") as well as in corporations, personnel departments are now called departments of human resources. And since all resources are disposable, they are at once replaceable. This is clearly manifest in the industry of consumer goods with its abundance of substitutes and, in an era of mass production, leads to the tendency to replace rather than repair used and unusable goods (GA15:369/FS 62). But extending the same attitudes to human resources is fraught with all manner of abuse, the extremes of which we have witnessed under the totalitarian regimes of the twentieth century.

Theodore Kisiel

STATE (*VERFASSUNG*). SEE CONSTITUTION.

STATEMENT (*SATZ*). SEE PRINCIPLE.

STATEMENT (*AUSSAGE*). SEE ASSERTION.

192.
STEADFASTNESS (*INSTÄNDIGKEIT*)

S TEADFASTNESS IS AN attitude or stance that relates affirmatively to the fact that we can understand neither ourselves nor the WORLD as objects seen from a totalizing, onto-theological point of view. Instead, we have to understand ourselves as being part of an incomprehensible ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*), in which we are somehow standing: we are steadfast (*inständig*) in adaptation. It is one of the central concerns of Heidegger's philosophy to evoke such an attitude. In his early lectures he advocates a turn (*Umwendung*), in *Being and Time* he argues for a self-understanding as BEING-IN-THE-WORLD in the stance of RESOLUTENESS (*Entschlossenheit*), and in his later texts he invites us to dwell in the FOURFOLD (*Wohnen im Geviert*), a dwelling that is related to the mood of RELEASEMENT (*Gelassenheit*). In his private texts from the late 1930s and early 1940s (GA65–71), he calls the attitude he is arguing for "steadfastness" (*Inständigkeit*).

The term steadfastness is rather enigmatic, however. It belongs to Heidegger's artificial language and differs from the common use in German. The adjective *inständig* usually means "imploring," "insistent," or "emphatic" and is used in phrases like *inständig bitten* ("to plead with someone," "to solicit someone") or *inständig hoffen* ("to hope urgently"). The nominalized adjective *Inständigkeit* normally means something like "urgency," and is very rarely used (most frequently to characterize the urgency with which one might, e.g., plead or hope). Obviously, this is not what Heidegger has in mind when he speaks, for example, about the *Inständigkeit* in the truth of BEYNG (*Wahrheit des Seyns*). Particularly, it is an attitude we take "in" the truth of beyng and not an attitude of it. Hence, this cannot be translated as "urgency" and rather has a spatial meaning, as in "standing in adaptation."

Consequently, steadfastness can be understood in terms of a spatial metaphor and as a nominalized version of "standing in something" (in German one would say *in etwas stehen* or, when nominalized, *Innestehen*). In the *Contributions to Philosophy* and in the following private texts Heidegger uses *Inständigkeit* synonymously with *Innestehen* (GA65:245, 467; GA67:240; GA69:197) and in his 1941 lecture on Schelling he explicitly explains that *Inständigkeit* has to be understood as *Innestehen* (GA49:54). He repeats this explicit explanation in his 1949 introduction to *Was ist Metaphysik?* (GA9: 374/283) and this spatial meaning of the term can also be found in the variations *inständlich* or *Inständlichkeit*. Here, the spatiality is more obvious, and Heidegger uses these variations synonymously with *inständig* and *Inständigkeit* too (GA65:26, 69, 80, 342; GA71:17, 211).

But steadfastness (*Inständigkeit*) should also be heard to have a temporal meaning, since the adjective *ständig* means "permanent," "constant," or "abiding." This too is explicitly emphasized by Heidegger in the above-mentioned instances (GA49:54; GA9:374/283). The temporal meaning of *Inständigkeit* is reflected in the archaic term employed by many translators: "inabiding." However, Heidegger uses the term far more often in its spatial meaning, which is only weakly reflected in the "in" of "inabiding." In contrast, the translation as "steadfastness" captures both the spatial sense (standing fast in a place) and the temporal sense (enduring through change).

In his lecture on Schelling in 1941 Heidegger also claims that the term "steadfastness" is supposed to replace the term "existence" in *Being and Time* to avoid confusions with Jaspers' philosophy of existence (GA49:54; cf. also GA6.2:434/EP 70–71, and GA9:374/283). However, steadfastness is an attitude that belongs to the right understanding of being and is related to the openness (*Offenheit*, GA49:68) and clearing (*Lichtung*, GA65:357) of being and to adaptation (GA65:233). This can only be understood with regard to an overall interpretation of these central Heideggerian concepts. They demonstrate the impossibility of an objective understanding of the world, and the ability to give up an objective understanding is directly connected to steadfastness (GA65:451). This failure of an objective understanding is expressed with the metaphor of the abyss, and it is steadfastness which is able to endure the ungroundedness of the abyss (GA67:62). As an attitude, steadfastness implies strength (*Stärke*), determination (*Entschiedenheit*), mildness (*Milde*) and simplicity (*Einfachheit*, GA65:298–99) and is essential for an adequate human self-understanding (GA66:145). Furthermore, Heidegger connects the attitude of RESOLUTENESS (*Entschlossenheit*) to steadfastness (GA38:163/135; GA65:144–45). In addition, there also is a connection between steadfastness and the attitude of releasement (*Gelassenheit*, GA13:65, 68, 71; GA77:145, 148, 151).

The central idea here is that we need a shift in our attitude toward the world (to emphasize that this involves an active stance-taking on our part, Heidegger also calls it a "steadfasting," an *Inständigung*; see GA70:107–09; GA71:140). This shift in attitude allows us to be "steadfast in the truth of being" (*Wahrheit des Seyns*), which is Heidegger's most used phrase in this context (GA6.2:434/EP 70; GA46:45, 92, 221; GA49:58, 63; GA66:63, 138, 328, 341; GA67:9, 59; GA69:13, 15, 207; GA70:103, 137, 143, 150; GA71:213, 310, 314; GA76:73, 101). There are some variations on this, such as "steadfastness in the essence of the truth of beyng" (GA66:78, 120), "steadfastness in the truth of the essence of beyng" (GA66:103), "steadfastness in the open of the truth of being" (GA49:74), "steadfastness in the truth of entities" (GA66:174), "steadfastness in the truth of adaptation" (GA70:110), and "steadfastness in the essence of truth" (GA69:87). Moreover, according to Heidegger the human being has to become steadfast in the clearing (*Lichtung*, GA5:349/263; GA49:76; GA66:31, 217; GA67:62, 219; GA71:49, 174, 197, 254; GA85:8, 27, 93), in the openness (*Offenheit*, GA5:54/40; GA15:345/FS 47; GA70: 54; GA85:70), in the questionableness (*Fragwürdigkeit*, GA65:158, 432; GA71:306; GA85:110), in beyng (*Seyn*, GA66:113; GA70:82, 150; GA71:109; GA75:13), in adaptation (*Ereignis*, GA65:72; GA71:55) and in many other concepts which, basically, are all related to the impossibility of an objectifying understanding of the self and the world.

<div align="right">*Rico Gutschmidt*</div>

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Heidegger elaborated the concept of steadfastness mainly in the years 1936–42; it is a crucial notion in GA49, GA65–67, GA 69–71, and GA85–87 (*passim*).

193.
STEP BACK (*SCHRITT ZURÜCK*)

THE "STEP BACK" is a methodological concept that emphasizes the importance of affirmatively refraining from certain familiar ways of approaching or representing something in order to open up a space for thought. For Heidegger, taking steps is a valid description of the "method" of philosophy. It is most notably by taking a "step back" (*Schritt zurück*) that philosophy is said to begin and takes its most radical form. Rather than describing a series of steps, Heidegger places all emphasis on the initiation of THINKING: thinking should begin by refraining from seemingly self-evident prejudices and unfounded philosophical beliefs. Only from such initial skepticism will a genuinely philosophical movement of thought develop.

The "step back" reformulates the idea of the phenomenological EPOCHÉ as "bracketing" of invalid assumptions while avoiding Husserl's reliance on an epistemologically privileged domain of CONSCIOUSNESS. Heidegger's deliberate use of an idiomatic expression is to offer an alternative to phenomenological jargon and its problematic metaphysical commitments.

The discussion of "stepping back" is closely related to Heidegger's affirmation of philosophy as pursuing a way or path (*Weg*) as an alternative to specifying a particular method for philosophy. "'Step back' does not mean an isolated step of thought, but rather means the manner in which thinking moves, and a long path" (GA11:59/ID 50). Where that step leads "develops and shows itself only in the execution of the step" (GA11:61/ID 52).

There is no encompassing argument showing what it entails to take the initial step back. Heidegger cautions: "no one can know whether and when and where and how this step of thinking will develop into a proper . . . path and way and road-building" (GA11:78/ID 72). But from discussions in different contexts several more general aspects emerge. The step back (1) grants access to a more original dimension of experience, (2) takes the form of emphatic questioning, and (3) does not involve a mere return to past philosophical achievement. Rather, stepping back critically renews philosophy. I'll consider three prominent examples where Heidegger deploys the notion of a step back.

(1) In *Being and Time*, Heidegger mentions that one needs to step back from the practical engagement with objects (such as a hammer) before one can articulate a state of affairs in propositional form. In order to "determine" (*bestimmen*) an object involved in a practice by means of attributing properties to it, it is necessary to "first take a step back." One will keep the "already apparent" in view but disregard its properties, reducing it to "this hammer there," in order to then determine the object by propositionally attributing to it some of its properties, i.e., "this hammer is too heavy" (SZ 155). The "step back" thus first refrains from practical engagement with an object, allowing reference in a different, propositional attitude to some aspect of the meaning constituted in the practice.

A similar description emerges from a different context, namely one of Heidegger's seminars on Schiller's "Letters on the Aesthetic Education of Man." For Schiller, a "step back" is needed in order to move from a particular attention to the sensible (sensuous drive) to voluntary action and the activity of thinking (formal drive). Heidegger glosses this as a return from passive or

active determination to mere "determinability" (*Bestimmbarkeit*). According to Heidegger, the harmonious aesthetic state in Schiller (play drive) can be understood as an "active determinability" (Heidegger 2005b, 67) resulting from the step back. The "step back" here again grants access to a more original dimension of human experience, though in this context this more original dimension is determined as sensibility. In one of his latest texts, Heidegger similarly describes the step back as a "retreat to that domain only indicated by the name of CLEARING, that domain in which we humans always already reside" (GA16:632/QDMT 222).

(2) In the "Letter on 'Humanism,'" Heidegger mentions that philosophy should not be "indulging in a special sort of profundity and of building complicated concepts." Its particular difficulty lies in that philosophy is "something simple" (*einfach*); simple philosophy is achieved when thinking steps back and thus takes the form of a "questioning that experiences" (GA9:343/261). Similarly, in notes for an introduction to the *Gesamtausgabe*, Heidegger urges his readers to "question more questioningly" (*fragender fragen*) and identifies this with "taking the step back." Heidegger here cautions that "stepping back" is not meant "temporally, historically" (*zeitlich-historisch*). Rather than a mere historical engagement with past philosophy, Heidegger emphasizes that the initial restraint of the step back itself represents the "character of thinking as a way" (GA1:437–40).

(3) This brings out a contrast of particular importance in Heidegger's engagement with Hegel in the essay "The Onto-theo-logical Constitution of Metaphysics" (GA11:51–79/ID 42–74), which is given the motto "we dare to attempt the step back" (GA11:51/ID 42): the skeptical moment of the "step back" (*Schritt zurück*) is no "going back" (*Rückgang*) to the HISTORY of philosophy or to "the earliest thinkers of Western philosophy" (GA11:61/ID 52). If the step back were to lead to the historical origins of philosophy, it could not yield the possibility of a genuine renewal of philosophical questioning. While Hegel's idea of the sublation (*Aufhebung*) of past philosophies integrates contemporary thinking with its history, effectively disallowing innovation in philosophy, Heidegger attempts a "*step back from the entirety of the sending of being*" (*Schritt zurück vor dem Ganzen des Seinsgeschickes*, GA11:59n.). Rather than achieving absolute knowledge or engaging in an intricate DESTRUCTION (*Destruktion*) of the history of philosophy, a step back from the history of philosophy is said to be sufficient "preparation" for understanding "what now *is*" (GA11:60/ID 51).

<div align="right">*Tobias Keiling*</div>

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Step and thinking GA7:183, 186/PLT 181–82, 185; GA13:82/PLT 10
Step and history GA11:51–81/ID 42–74

<div align="center">

STOCK (*BESTAND*). SEE STANDING RESERVE.

STOP FOR A WHILE (*AUFENTHALT*). SEE SOJOURN.

STORY (*GESCHICHTE*). SEE HISTORY.

STRIFE (*STREIT*). SEE POLEMOS.

STRUCTURATION (*GLIEDERUNG*). SEE JOINTEDNESS.

</div>

194.
STRUCTURE (*STRUKTUR*)

A STRUCTURE IS AN organization of constituent features of a WHOLE – an organization in virtue of which that whole can perform a FUNCTION. Thus, Heidegger explains, structure is "read off" of a function (GA1:417/BH 62).

One *formally* describes a structure by specifying the *types* of relationship that necessarily must obtain between *types* of elements in order for the whole to perform its function. Thus, everything that performs a certain function will possess those types of elements standing in that type of relation. If in a particular concrete case, a thing that is defined as performing a certain function lacks some of those elements, or if its elements don't stand in their proper relationship, then it is understood as a deficient case of instantiating the structure (but note that this means it is still understood in terms of possessing those elements in that relationship – in other words, it is understood as failing to fully instantiate the structure).

With most entities, the influence of function on structure is *not* a one-way street. The structure opens up and constrains the function that the entity can perform. This becomes particularly apparent as contexts change and entities move into new situations where different ends or purposes come to organize the current world, for the function the entity is suited to perform in the new context will be constrained by its structure.

Heidegger's approach to ONTOLOGY is structural in the sense that he generally proceeds by identifying the structural features constitutive of the BEING of entities (see SZ 12). "All explicata to which the analytic of Dasein gives rise," Heidegger explains, "are obtained by considering Dasein's existence-structure" (SZ 44). A primary issue tackled in *Being and Time* is "the task of inquiring into the ontological structure of the 'WORLD'" (SZ 53).

The terms that Heidegger employs in his ontology "are to be taken as ontological structural concepts" (SZ 56), meaning that we are easily misled if we understand them as having their ordinary, everyday signification. Instead, Heidegger redefines terms so that they denote only the structural elements that play a role in performing a specific ontological function. For instance, *Verfallen*, typically translated into English as "FALLING," has connotations in colloquial German of dilapidation or decay. But, Heidegger insists, it names for him an "ontological-existential structure" that "would be misunderstood if one were to attribute to it the sense of a bad or deplorable ontical property" (SZ 176). Instead, the meaning of falling is defined as a structural element in the overall function of temporalizing, and corresponds to the present moment in the opening up of a temporal horizon for human existence in the world. The colloquial connotations of many other words are similarly stripped away as Heidegger searches for "a stable coinage for the appropriate structural concepts" (SZ 55). CARE, for instance, "is to be taken as an ontological structural concept" that "has nothing to do with 'tribulation,' 'melancholy,' or the 'cares of life'" (SZ 57). Other structural concepts abound: MOOD (SZ 134), UNDERSTANDING (SZ 311), INTERPRETATION and ASSERTION (SZ 223), DISCOURSE

(SZ 162–63) – each of these are redefined in terms of ontological structure, and thus are able to function in Heidegger's account of being as structural moments of care in the ontological structural sense (SZ 335).

Mark A. Wrathall

STRUGGLE (*KAMPF*). SEE POLEMOS.

195.
SUBJECT, SUBJECTIVITY (*SUBJEKT, SUBJEKTIVITÄT*)

A subject in the broad sense is that which sustains properties or attributes. In a narrower sense, something is a subject when it is possessed of subjectivity – that means, when it sustains properties that are "inner" in the sense that they can be as they are independently of the conditions of the world around them. Although the notions of subject and subjectivity were central to Husserl's phenomenology after 1913, which was supposed to be an "egology," Heidegger views these notions mainly as negative markers in the Western tradition that point to what has been occluded and is worth retrieving.

Heidegger associates the notions of "subject" and "subjectivity" with at least four themes, overlapping in many respects: (1) mainly in *Being and Time*, subjectivity represents the obstacle to thinking human existence in a fundamentally ontological sense; (2) subjectivity is linked to a specific epistemological attitude that needs to be overturned: the subject–object connection; (3) subjectivity represents a specific moment in the Western tradition, through Descartes and Kant, when the certainty the subject has of itself as *cogito me cogitare* became the criterion of the truth (GA6.2:135/N4 106) and, as such, instrumental in determining an object as what is categorized by subjectivity; and (4) subjectivity becomes a tool for the mastery of nature in the form of a machination and technology, transforming nature into a standing reserve of resources for human beings.

With regard to the first theme, in *Being and Time* Heidegger tries to think human existence away from a subject characterized as a substance and thus away from the categories of mere occurrentness (*Vorhandenheit*) that apply to things. He wants to avoid thinking of human beings as subjects, i.e., as something that lies at the basis, a *hupokeimenon*, just as any other substance. By emphasizing in human existence the dimension of "being-in-the-world" and "care" (*Sorge*), Heidegger tries to work out new "existentials" that will identify the specific ontological status of human beings as Dasein who have a privileged link to being – an understanding of being – and are the only entities for whom their being is a question or a concern.

With regard to the second theme, given that our theory of knowledge is defined by the correlation between subject and object, a new ontological understanding of human existence has significant epistemological consequences. Husserl already redefined this relationship between subject and object as an intentional relationship of consciousness toward an object, so that consciousness is always "consciousness of" and the object is an object "for consciousness." Although Heidegger is still claiming to be in the phenomenological framework, his ontological investigation is far more radical. Because consciousness is part of an existence within the world that is characterized by care, objects are, first, disclosed to human beings before being "objects" of thought. Intentionality is thus not only a "lived experience" (*Erlebnis*) as in Husserl, but an existential situation. As

Heidegger says in early 1930, "commonly: 'object,' 'subject'; properly: manifestation [*Offenbarkeit*], understanding of being [*Seinsverständnis*]" (GA34:112). What is called "object" is in fact a secondary qualification of what has been, first, disclosed and thus related to this disclosure; similarly, what we call "subject" is a secondary qualification of an understanding of oneself with regard to one's own being. As a consequence, the truth cannot be merely subjective as if it was just a matter of judgments and propositions. The truth is a matter of disclosure within which subjects and objects materialize as secondary concretions, as it were.

With regard to the third theme, Heidegger sees the prominence of subjectivity in modernity as a turning point in our tradition. Like many other thinkers, he considers Descartes and Kant as initiating this moment and movement of enlightenment with its faith in reason and progress. Different from many philosophers, Heidegger also sees this turning point as a severe occultation of the possibilities that were still enclosed in ancient Greek thinking. Once human beings are defined as "subjects," in the sense of being certain of themselves and knowing themselves – they know their own ideas or representations – anything that "is" becomes a subjective formation as what is articulated in propositions and judged by subjects. The world itself becomes a subjective formation, "subjected" to a set of preordained categories that originate from the subject. Heidegger uses the term "subjectity" (*Subiectität* or *Subjektität*) to name this commonality between the subject – defining itself by self-certainty – and the object determined as a "subject" in a judgment when ascertained in representations (GA6.2:410/EP 46; GA5:184/138).

With regard to the fourth theme, subjectivity after modernity has become a tool for gaining mastery over nature, putting into subjection and opening the way for what Heidegger calls "MACHINATION." This is a global taking over by TECHNOLOGY of what should be a concern for human beings, their being. At this moment when things have been converted into instruments and their ontological status changed into a susceptibility to be transformed into anything, we have, Heidegger says, not only an oblivion of being, but even an ABANDONMENT OF BEING in the sense that things suffer a deficit. They are "less being" or there is a deficit in being, which indicates a coming to an end or at least an exhaustion of the tradition. However, this abandonment of being can also lead to what will be "another" beginning or INCEPTION. In this in-between, human beings are still Dasein, as human existence, but, different from *Being and Time*, this human existence is itself made possible by an event or ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*), which makes existence a place between what human beings understand themselves and what provides the historical conditions for their dwelling. "The relationship between being and the ESSENCE of human beings is ... adaptation [*Ereignis*]" (GA55:382).

Despite these apocalyptic tones, these notions of first and other inception can also be understood synchronically as the fact that, when we speak and think as subjects, there is an underlying HISTORY that has made possible this speaking and THINKING. Instead of being historical markers, the first and the other inception can also be more simply existential markers, pointing out, in our well-formed and rigorously argued propositions, a moment of production that has allowed us to be subjects. It is a reminder that we always speak in the position of addressees, that thinking itself is a response. Despite the temptations of subjectivism and mastery, we can instead think "inceptually" (*anfänglich*), as if at the beginning. The existential consequence of this shift of attitude or this de-subjectivization of the subject is that we should

see ourselves as "mortals," inhabiting a world of which we are only one parameter. We are DWELLING as guests to whom hospitality has been granted.

Pol Vandevelde

FURTHER READING

Bernet 1994b, Dahlstrom 2001, Foucault 2005, Gadamer 2014, Husserl 1991, Vandevelde 2014

SWAY, HOLDING SWAY (*WALTEN*). SEE PREVAILING.

196.

SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT(ION)ING (*GE-STELL*). SEE ALSO INVENTORY (*GE-STELL*)

Syn-thetic com-posit(ion)ing – in short, com-positioning – is "the gathering, the integration of all the modes of placing, positioning, and positing that im*pose* themselves upon the human being to the extent that it ex-sists today" (GA15:388/FS 74).[1]

There is a subtle ingenuity latent in Heidegger's defining the essence of modern TECHNOLOGY by a single hyphenated word, *Ge-Stell*. In the last two decades of his life, Heidegger repeatedly explains what *Ge-Stell* is, and repeatedly insists on sharply distinguishing this sense from the everyday senses of *Gestell*, as in *Büchergestell* (bookcase) and *Brillengestell* (eyeglasses frame). It must therefore be emphatically asserted that *Ge-Stell* is simply *not* "frame, framework or enframing," the current English translations drawn from German–English dictionaries. What then is *Ge-Stell* in its global essentiality? It is, in Heidegger's breakdown of this single word, "the gathering unity of all the ways of setting in place, positioning, positing (*Stellens*]" (GA15:366/FS 60).[2] "The prefix *Ge-* [in *Ge-Stell*] speaks to the gathering, unification, bringing-together of all the kinds of positing and positioning" (GA15:391/FS 75).[3]

Against the current English favorite of "enframing," I therefore propose an etymological translation of *Ge-Stell* from its Greek and Latin roots as "syn-thetic com-posit(ion)ing," where the Greek-rooted adjective "synthetic" adds the note of artifactuality and even artificiality to the synthesis of positions and posits. For me, *Ge-Stell* as "syn-thetic com-posit(ion)ing" presciently portends the twenty-first-century globalizations of the interneted World Wide Web with its virtual infinity of websites in cyberspace, Global Positioning Systems (GPS), interconnecting air traffic control grids, world-embracing weather maps, the 24/7 world news coverage of cable TV networks like CNN, etc., etc., all of which are structured by complex programming based on the computerized and ultimately simple Leibnizian binary-digital logic generating an infinite number of combinations of the posit (1) and non-posit (0). The synthetic compositing of binary-digital logic thus maps out the grand artifact of the technological infrastructure that networks the entire globe of our planet Earth.

---

[1] Citation from 1973 Zähringen seminar. The same point was already made in a rich note circa 1955, whose first sentence reads: "Im Wort 'Gestell' spricht die Versammlung des Stellens, in der 'Versammlung' spricht das Echo zum *Logos*, im 'Stellen' spricht das Echo der *Thesis* (*Poiêsis*)" (GA76:320; see also 327, 365).

[2] The citation is taken from the seminar at Le Thor in 1969.

[3] Citation taken from the seminar at Zähringen in 1973.

1 FORESHORTENING OF TIME AND SPACE

The phenomenon of technological globalization was already apparent by the time the so-called "Great War" of 1914–18 came to a conclusion, which was eventually renamed the World War. One of the heroes of this highly mechanized war, Ernst Jünger, in his accounts of the total mobilization (*totale Mobilmachung*) that occurred in the last year of the war, attributed this phenomenon to planetary technology and its use in the struggle for planetary domination. This becomes Heidegger's word for globalization in this period to phenomenologically describe the human experience that results from the network of matrices constructed by modern technology to guide and control the so-called "air waves" which harness the natural electromagnetic radiation occurring across the surface of our planet Earth for human use and consumption. Globalization is essentially a time-space term, a dynamic term that spells out a quasi-infinite velocity in nanoseconds through its virtual abolition of space into bi-locative simultaneity and its instantaneous reduction of all time differences. By the early twentieth century, radio technology had advanced sufficiently for Heidegger to be struck by the drastic foreshortening of time and space and its global reach. In the famous "pincers" passage of SS 1935, Heidegger dramatically describes the global geopolitical situation of a post-war Germany being squeezed by two international movements, both of them technological juggernauts, on the western front by American capitalism and on the eastern front by Bolshevistic communism, in the following words:

> Russia and America, when viewed metaphysically, are both the same: the same hopeless frenzy of unchained technology and of the groundless organization of the average man. When the farthest corner of the globe [*der Erdball*, the terrestrial globe versus Heidegger's beloved *terra firma*] has been technically conquered and can be economically exploited; when any incident you like, in any place you like, at any time you like, becomes accessible as fast as you like; when you [by way of radio] can simultaneously "experience" an assassination attempt against a [Yugoslavian] king in France and a symphony concert in Tokyo; *when time is nothing but speed, instantaneity, and simultaneity, and time as history has vanished from the Dasein of all peoples*; when a boxer counts as the great man of a people; when the tallies of millions at mass meetings are a triumph; then, yes then, there still looms like a specter over all this uproar the question: what for? – where to? – and what then? [in short, the question of be-ing in the 20th century]. (GA40:40f./40)

Clearly, Heidegger was suspicious of this instantaneity and simultaneity of the Time technologized by global communication primarily because *it abolishes the time of situated history, the time of Da-sein*. In 1935, this time-space foreshortening results from the medium of the radio along with the wire services of newspapers, but it just as readily reflects with uncanny foresight the more advanced digital-media systems of the twenty-first century. As Heidegger observes in 1949, by plane and by radio and soon by TV, "all distances in time and space are shrinking" (GA79:3/3). He calls this the phenomenon of the distanceless (*das Abstandslose*). Distant locales and exotic places are shown on TV or film so realistically that you may even feel that YOU ARE THERE (as we were with the riveting event of 9/11 in 2001), there and there and everywhere in a technologically induced bi-locative simultaneity. Heidegger asks: "what is happening here

when, as a result of the abolition of great distances, everything is equally far and equally near? What is this uniformity in which everything is neither far nor near and, as it were, without distance? Everything washes together into the uniformly distanceless. How? Is not this merging of all into the distanceless more uncanny than everything being blown out of place?" (GA79:4/4). What Heidegger misses in this all-too-familiar modern experience is a genuine experience of nearness, the proximity of be-ing. Because the experience of nearness fails to materialize with this abolition of all distances, the phenomenon of the distanceless came to dominate our lives in the twentieth century (GA79:20/19).

2 MASSIVE STORAGE OF STANDING RESERVES/RESOURCES

Heidegger's own examples of com-positioning begin in a farmer's field about to be exploited for its mineral deposits, be it for coal or even uranium ore. Instead of being cultivated, the land is now being challenged to yield energy, where we *set upon*[4] the land in order to extract coal or ore from it, then store this energy resource in order to have it ready for use. The hydroelectric plant is *set into* the Rhine river, thereby damming it up to build up water pressure which then *sets* the turbines turning whose thrust in turn generates and *sets* the electric current going into the network of long-distance lines, where the systematic transforming, storing, distributing, and switching of electrical energy takes place (GA7:15–17/QCT 14–16). Be it coal or hydroelectric power or atomic energy, in each case "Nature is positioned for its energy," nature is forced to yield its energy. Nature, thus held up to yield energy, emerges henceforth as the "storage-place of energy," like a global fuel depot or gigantic gas station.

Storage of resources, be it energy or information, becomes a very central feature of the com-positioning, which Heidegger calls *its fundamental unconcealment*. "Everywhere, everything is ordered to *stand by*, to be immediately *positioned* for use, in fact to stand there to be on call for a further ordering [*Bestellen*]. . . . Whatever is ordered about in this way has its own standing. We call it the standing reserve [*Bestand*]." And now comes the perhaps surprising denouement of com-positioning from the philosophical perspective: "Whatever stands by in the sense of standing reserve no longer stands over against us as object" (GA7:17/QCT 17). "Thus when man, in investigating and observing, ensnares nature as an area of his own conceiving, he has already been claimed by a way of revealing that challenges him to approach nature as an object of research, until even the object disappears into the objectlessness of standing reserve" (GA7:19/QCT 19). Heidegger in a parallel essay also notes that recent cyclotron experiments in nuclear physics likewise encounter this phenomenon of the complete disappearance of the OBJECT, which hitherto had been the very hallmark of modern science. But "that does not mean that the subject-object relation vanishes, but rather the opposite: it now attains its most extreme dominance, predetermined from out of syn-thetic com-positioning. It becomes a standing-reserve to be commanded and placed on order" (GA7:55/QCT 173). The subject–object relation now reaches, for the first time, its purely "relational" character, that is, its character of orderability, in which both the subject and the object are claimed as standing reserves.

The more modern technology unfolds and develops, the more objectivity transforms itself into disposability (availability, accessibility). Now there are no more objects (no more entities standing

---

[4] Here, *stellen* is translated in various idioms of "to set." The typical translations of *stellen* are "put, place, set, stand," with strong overlaps with the verbs *setzen* and *legen*.

over against a subject that takes them into view) – there are only standing reserves positioned to be available on demand, entities held ready for plan-directed use. Political economists in fact no longer deal with objects but instead systematically order the space with an overall plan toward maximizing the utility of resources. Entities as a whole are ordered within a horizon of usefulness and disposability of all that needs to be placed under control. The planners themselves are no longer scientifically oriented toward a field of objects but now emerge in their true gestalt as technicians and even technocrats, i.e., humans who see entities a priori in the horizon of making-them-useful and available on demand. It can no longer appear in the objective neutrality of an over-against. There is nothing other than reserve resources: warehoused stock, inventories of consumer goods, stores of material goods, banks of electrical power available on demand, energy reserves, capital reserves, federal reserve funds, not to speak of the quasi-infinite store of information in the so-called memory banks of the interneted World Wide Web. Information has become our most massive global standing reserve; next comes electronic money kept "liquid" by global holders of reserve funds like the World Bank and International Monetary Fund, followed by energy reserves made available through increasingly interconnected power grids, electrical or otherwise; the last are stores of material and consumer goods ready to be ordered online. There are no longer any objects but only "production resources" and "consumer goods" at the disposal of everyone, who themselves are put into service in the business of production and consumption. In universities (now called "knowledge industries") as well as in corporations, personnel departments are now called departments of human *resources*. And since all resources are disposable, they are at once replaceable. This is clearly manifest in the industry of consumer goods with its abundance of substitutes and, in an era of mass production, leads to the tendency to replace rather than repair used goods (GA15:369/FS 62). But extending the same attitudes to *human* resources is fraught with all manner of abuse, the extremes of which we have witnessed under the totalitarian regimes of the twentieth century.

The disruption in the global flow of standing reserves caused by the Japanese tsunami of 2011 illustrates another phenomenon unique to modern technology, namely, that Heidegger's broken hammer experience has apparently gone global. The widely adopted Toyota strategy of just-in-time inventories for its production lines led, as a result of the earthquake, to drastic disruptions in the supply lines of numerous automobile production lines around the world. Massive power outages and recent identity thefts of mega-lists pirated on the internet are further examples of the broken hammer experience gone global. Recall the fears of massive attacks on the internet and World Wide Web by cyber-terrorists in the millennial year of Y2K. Among other things, it conjures the image of the lightning-speed electronic circulation of vast sums of currency whipping around the world's financial markets in a global cash flow whose reverberations sometimes verge on a cascading collapse. Such a globally impelled crash, whether by impersonal market forces or computer hackers, would make the worldwide depression of 1929, at least in its velocity of impact, pale into insignificance.

To be sure, all of these examples of global disruption occur in the high-velocity time-space of modern technology, which is not at all comparable with the more vitally "measured" time-space of the broken hammer experience. Recall that the broken hammer experience retrospectively reminds us of the referential context and its vital connections that the broken hammer interrupts, say, in the work world of the carpenter. At one point, Heidegger asks what exactly is the "basic referential context" (*Grundverweisungszusammenhang*, GA76:302) of a "world" of machination, and notes its radical difference from the referential world of handwork and hand tools by

pointing to the regulated and uninterrupted repeatability "in exactly the same way" of the "mechanical" motions of the machine and the more calculative referential relations necessary for its manufacture (GA76:307). The "machine is not an 'imitation' of handwork and natural processes but rather a self-standing organization of all the processes of entities" (GA76:308). And this organization in its deliberately calculated mechanical design is not even a world. Heidegger thus speaks of an "unworlding and unearthing of entities" in the machinations of com-positioning (GA76:307) where entities stand in a state of total abandonment by being (*Seinsverlassenheit*, GA76:297).

3 FROM DAS GE-STELL TO DAS ER-EIGNIS

We are accordingly moving from the epoch of objectivity (*Gegenständlichkeit*) to the **e**poch of disposability (*Beständlichkeit*), the most extreme gestalt of the history of the metaphysics of constant presence since the Greeks. "Because we no longer encounter what is called *Ge-Stell* within the horizon of representation, the view that allows us to think of the be-ing of entities as presence, *Ge-Stell* no longer approaches us as something present and thus seems at first alien and strange" (GA11:44f./ID 35f.). As the most extreme gestalt of the history of the metaphysics of constant presence, and so the completion and fulfillment of that metaphysics, com-positioning assumes a strange constant absence which in effect serves to point it in another direction, to serve as a passage from metaphysics to another thinking governed by ADAPTATION or the properizing event, *das Er-eignis*. *Ge-Stell* is thus "Janus-faced ... it is essentially double-sided ... it is so to speak the photographic negative of *Ereignis*" (GA15:366/FS 60). Accordingly, "an outstanding way to draw near to *das Er-eignis*, would be to *look deeply into the essence of com-positioning*" (*ibid.*). The com-positioning thus prompts REFLECTION (*Be-sinnung*), a meditation on its sense. It is therefore not a matter of regarding the emergence of technology as a negative event (and certainly even less as a positive event, as if it were a paradise on earth). "That in and from which man and being approach and challenge each other in the technological world claims us in the manner of syn-thetic com-positioning. In the reciprocal self-positing of man and be-ing we discern the claim that defines the constellation of our age" (GA11:45/ID 35). With the com-positioning, it appears that we are on the verge of overcoming the subject–object relation and entering into the mutual ownership of man and be-ing that the properizing event is.

> The intimate *be-longing* together of man and be-ing in the manner of a mutually escalating challenge brings us in startling fashion nearer to that and how man is delivered over to the ownership of be-ing and be-ing is appropriated to the essence of man. Within com-positioning there prevails a rare and exceptional ownership and appropriation. We must simply experience this owning in which man and be-ing are proper for one another, i.e., we must enter into what we call *Ereignis* ... a *singulare tantum* ... unique.... What we experience in com-positioning as the constellation of being and man through the modern world of technology is a *prelude* to what is called *Er-eignis*. For in *Er-eignis* there resides the possibility that it may turn the sheer prevalence of com-positioning into a more inceptive adapting. Such a transformation of com-positioning into *das Er-eignis* would by virtue of this event bring the appropriate recovery – appropriate, thus never to be made by man alone – of the world of technology out of its domination back to servitude in the realm by which man reaches more properly into the properizing event. (GA11:45f./ID 36f.)

> Presuming that we could wait in anticipation for the possibility that com-positioning, the reciprocal challenge of man and be-ing in the calculation of the calculable, would address itself to us as the *Er-eignis* that first expropriates man and be-ing into their proper [character]; then a path would be freed for man to experi-ence entities in a more inceptive way – the totality of the modern technological world, nature, and history, and above all their being. (GA11:49/ID 40)

In Heidegger's depiction, therefore, at the most extreme extremity of the history of the metaphysics of constant presence, we find ourselves poised at the very threshold of crossing over into an authentic experience of being in *Er-eignis*. But despite the apparent and so tantalizing proximity of this ex-perience, we are not given to expect a smooth gradual crossing over to it, simply because of the extremities at which we are poised: the machinations of technology have resulted in the complete abandonment of entities by being and the human being is in peril of not only forgetting his essential be-ing but even of having forgotten this forgetting of being. "But in this extreme extremity of destining peril the most intimate relationship [of man and being] shows itself, but shows itself only as a completely veiled hint" (GA76:327). It is necessary to push the ex-*peri*-ence of the *peril* of technology to the extreme to glimpse the e-vent emerging in the com-positioning. Accordingly, Heidegger recommends not attempting to arrest or to master technology but to drive it to its extreme in order to ex-peri-ence it in its full peril to the human being, and at the same time to meditate on the meaning of its destining essence (GA76:255). Heidegger, following Hölderlin, prompts the "sons of the Alps" to make the perilous crossing "over the abyss on lightly built bridges" by invoking these encouraging lines from Hölderlin's "Patmos": "But where peril is / also grows the saving." How the extreme peril of technology might allow us to glimpse "the growing light of a saving [power]" is suggested by the hint that the Greek word *techne* is the common root of both technology and art, even the fine arts (GA7:29–36/QCT 28–35). By way of this hint, com-positioning at its extreme of unworlding (*Entweltung*) and unearthing (*Enterdung*) may well be transformable into the ꜰᴏᴜʀꜰᴏʟᴅ (*Geviert*) world of earth and sky, gods and mortals.

This crossing over from com-positioning (*Ge-Stell*) to fourfold (*Geviert*) once again operates between extremes that, in their extreme contrast, provide clues for the crossing. How? Consider, for example, the abolition of time and space that comes with modern technology, where everything is equally far and equally near, inducing a uniformity in which everything is neither far nor near, is, as it were, without distance, such that everything is washed together into the uniformly distanceless. What is missing in this all-too-familiar modern experience of time and space is a genuine experience of nearness, the proximity of be-ing. But that very experience of missing the near opposed to the far in their authentic presential sense is the beginning of meditative thinking – for which nearness can become conspicuous by its very absence – and of the turn toward moving beyond the essence of modern technology as com-positioning, which in its essence does not admit of any qualitative nearness or farness (GA79:45/32). Com-positioning in its essence disallows nearness. And what nearness (*Nähe*) truly nears is the intimacy of a world as a neighborhood (*Nähe*) in which we can dwell meaningfully (GA79:46/44). "Com-positioning as the completed destiny of the forgetting of the essence of be-ing inconspicuously radiates a ray of the distant arrival of world. The fact that world refuses its worlding here does not mean that nothing happens with world: the refusal itself radiates the lofty nearness of the most distant farness of world" (GA79:53/50).

A crucial opposition is clearly emerging in our consideration of modern technology, namely, the contradistinction between the technical time-space of the distanceless versus the time-space of historical Dasein. In SS 1928 Heidegger characterized the historical world as a temporal playing field (*Zeit-Spiel-Raum*) that grants Da-sein the freedom of movement within a finite world of distinct historical possibilities. One is tempted nowadays to compare this basic contradistinction with that between the cyberspace of virtual reality and the concrete space of historical reality, by way of the many recent crossovers from virtual to historical reality in organizing protest movements on line, be it for environmental, economic, political, or social causes. The most recent twenty-first-century technologies like the internet have often had a liberating effect as compared to the twentieth century, which often employed technology as totalitarian tools of domination like the propaganda propagated by newspapers/radio/film and the leveling of *das Man* to uniformity and conformity. Have *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and 'Big Brother' become figments of the past now overcome, at least on the global scale in which they were fictionally portrayed?

On other occasions, Heidegger describes this contradistinction as being between a technical world of functionality and the lived world of meaningfulness, which are the topics of two radically different kinds of thinking, calculative thinking and meditative thinking (*be-sinnendes Denken*), which accordingly meditates on the sense (*Sinn*) of being. In the *Spiegel* interview of 1966, for example, where Heidegger admits to being frightened (*erschrocken*) when he first saw the pictures of the earth taken from the moon, he remarks: "We do not need atomic bombs at all [to uproot us] – the uprooting of man is already here. All our relationships have become merely technical ones. It is no longer upon an earth that man lives today" (GA16:669–70/HR 325). He finds it uncanny to be living in a world in which everything is pure function, and this functioning simply leads to more functioning, where this technicity increasingly dislodges humans and uproots them from the earth and their native roots. This takes us to another formulation of our contradistinction, that of the global versus the local, which is quite apt to the old Heidegger's concerns, as he meditates on the impact of technological giganticism on local traditions and on the rhythms and ways of life in the "good old days."

4   MEDITATING ON THE MEANING OF MODERN TECHNOLOGY

Heidegger assumes a less terrified and more meditative and placid (*gelassene*) tone toward compositioning in his 1955 talk in Messkirch, published under the title *Gelassenheit* but whose original title for the hometown crowd that first heard it was "Autochthony in the Atomic Age" ("Bodenständigkeit im Atomzeitalter").[5] He notes here that it is not only *schwäbischer Boden* that has produced great poets and thinkers, but also the *Boden* of Middle Germany, East Prussia, Silesia, as well as Bohemia, has inspired its great poets and thinkers (GA16:521/DT 47). What is this ground (*Boden*) that produces great poets and thinkers? Nothing less than the native

---

[5] The adjective *bodenständig* is typically translated as "indigenous, native" so that the more abstract *Bodenständigkeit* etymologically suggests being native to a land or a nation and, even more starkly (and mythologically), having one's roots in native soil. Whence the clear possibility of using this term for nationalistic and even for racist ends, as was the case in Nazi Blubo (= *Blut und Boden*) propaganda. And Heidegger here is speaking directly to a post-war native German audience. But it should be noted that Heidegger first used the word often enough in the 1920s in a phenomenological and so non-nationalistic context to connote the re-duction "back to the origins, roots, native ground" of original experience. This is important to note when we try to redirect his suggestions toward our own unique situation of being caught up in our twenty-first-century *Ge-Stell*.

language in which one finds oneself rooted, the earth and ground of language in its dialects in their tonality, rhythms, and song, in short, the down-to-earth language of original experience.

To come to terms with the inexorable onslaught of modern technology on his hometown and environs, Heidegger advises his *Landsmenschen* to strive to cultivate two basic comportments in order to learn to cope with the flood of technical devices that were already working their way into the life and fabric of the town and gradually making themselves more or less indispensable. The first comportment involves affirming the inevitable use of technical devices but denying them the right to dominate our lives, i.e., letting technical things be what they are but then willing to let them go to avoid becoming slavishly dependent on them. Heidegger identifies this yes/no comportment toward technical devices as the RELEASEMENT toward THINGS (*Gelassenheit zu den Dingen*).

> Having this comportment we no longer view things merely in a technical way. . . . We notice that while the production and use of machines demands of us another relation to things, it is not a meaning-less [*sinn-los*] relation. Farming and agriculture, e.g., have now become a motorized food industry. Thus here, evidently, as elsewhere, a profound change is taking place in man's relation to nature and to the world. But the sense [*Sinn*] that reigns in this change remains obscure. (GA16:527/DT 54f.)

The issue here, accordingly, is to make sense of all this high tech infiltrating into our lives through meditative (*be-sinnendes*) thinking. For example, what are we to make of the fact that "Nature is becoming a gigantic gas station, an energy source for modern technology and industry" (GA16:523/DT 50), a storage-place for energy, thus a "natural resource" subject to the calculations of those wishing to exploit it for profit or conquest?

> There is then in all technical processes a meaning, not invented or made by us, which lays claim to what we do and leave undone. We do not know the significance of the uncanny increasing dominance of atomic technology. *The meaning pervading technology hides itself.* But if we explicitly and continuously heed the fact that such hidden meaning touches us everywhere in the world of technology, we stand at once within the realm of that which hides itself from us, and hides itself just in approaching us. That which shows itself and at the same time withdraws is the essential trait of what we call mystery. I call the comportment that enables us to remain open to the meaning hidden in technology, *openness for the* MYSTERY [*Offenheit für das Geheimnis*]. (GA16:527f./DT 55)

Releasement toward technical things and openness for the mystery of the meaning of modern technology: These two comportments combined serve to promote meditative thinking and so to counter the threat of becoming so bedazzled by the marvels of modern technology that calculative thinking comes to be accepted as the only way of thinking. Humans would thereby deny and throw away their essential nature of being meditative beings and no longer nurture their capacity for meditative thinking (GA16:528f./DT 56). In our present situation, we are called upon to be open to the mystery of the global domination of technology and to meditatively ponder the profound changes that it is exacting upon our relations with nature and the world in order that we might find meaningful ways for us to live in this new world. For these two comportments

> grant us the possibility of *dwelling in the world in a totally different way*. They promise us a new ground and foundation [*Boden*] upon which we can stand and endure in the

world of technology without being imperiled by it. . . . They give us a vision of a new autochthony that someday might even be fit to bring back the old and now rapidly disappearing autochthony in a transformed gestalt. (GA16:528/DT 55)

If releasement toward things and openness for the mystery awaken within us, we might arrive at a path that will lead to a new ground and foundation [*Boden*]. In that *Boden* the creativity that produces lasting works could strike new roots. (GA16:529/DT 56f.)

5   THE GESTELL OF THE GESTALT OF THE WORK OF ART: HISTORICAL HUMANITY

One kind of "lasting works [that] could strike new roots" to which Heidegger gives particular attention is the work of art. It deserves our final attention here as well, since Heidegger in 1935 finds a more focused localized sense of com-positioning operative in the gestalt of a work of art, which evokes a 1956 cautionary note from him to distinguish this more focused sense from the more sweeping sense of com-positioning that is operative on a global scale in modern technology (GA5:70–73/52–54). But it also provides the opportunity for us to examine the different sort of gathering of modes of *stellen* that are operative in a work of art.

Briefly put, the artwork works by setting itself up (*sich aufstellen*) as a world and setting itself forth (*sich her-stellen*) as earth by setting itself back (*sich zurückstellen*) into the earth and finally the setting and fixing in place (*Feststellen*) of the strife of truth – that is, the strife of world and earth – in the gestalt of the work (GA5:30–36/22–27, 51–55/38–40). "Art is the setting and fixing in place of self-establishing truth in the gestalt" (GA5:59/44). The Greek *morphe* understood as gestalt, form, or figure now integrates a com-positioning that gathers together the various settings that charge the dynamic strife of truth and focuses them in the bounding confines of the gestalt of the artwork.

"The poetizing project of truth, which sets itself into the work as a gestalt . . . is projected to the coming preservers, that is, to a historical humanity" (GA5:63/47). The preservers (the promoters and interpreters) of the artwork now take their place in the between of the strife of world and earth, clearing and concealment. As especially the Heidegger of the thirties sees it, the artwork situates us in a historical world of a historical people in search of its identity, possibilities, and destiny. And the artwork itself is but one of the fundamental forms of the historical happening of truth. There are also, notably, philosophical questioning and state-founding deeds. Such a historical world with its tradition of deeds and sacrifices and concepts and artworks assigns a people its appointed task (*Aufgegebenes*) which guides it to its future world of possibilities (GA39:292–94). This appointed task unique to a people at once discloses a native endowment (*Mitgegebenes*) already given to it on the basis of what it has been. Clearly, the appointed task of today's historical humanity is to ponder the meaning of the profound change that is taking place by way of the essence of modern technology, syn-thetic com-posit(ion)ing, and to ready itself, in accord with its native endowment, to meaningfully cope with this change in a way that remains true to its own unique situation of be-ing as well as its native endowment (be it German or American or another historical humanity).

Theodore Kisiel

FURTHER READING

Kisiel 2014, Kisiel 2017

T

TALK (*REDE, REDEN*). SEE DISCOURSE.

TALK (*GEREDE*). SEE IDLE TALK.

197.
TECHNOLOGY (*TECHNIK*)

Technology is a mode of revealing that discloses everything as a resource to be placed on call, made available to be used in a maximal number of ways while placing the minimal possible demands on us. "Technology" translates the German word *Technik*, which is derived from the Greek *techne* (GA7:14/QCT 12). In "Die Frage nach der Technik" ("The Question concerning Technology") Heidegger differentiates between technological gadgets and systems, on the one hand, and the disclosive activity – *techne* – that makes them possible, on the other. He offers a typical "instrumental and anthropological" definition of technology as follows: "the manufacture and utilization of equipment, tools, and machines, the manufactured and used things themselves, and the needs and ends that they serve, all belong to what technology is. The whole complex of these contrivances is technology" (GA7:7–8/QCT 4–5). Although this definition is "uncannily correct" so far as it goes, Heidegger claims that it fails to reveal that "the essence of technology is by no means anything technological" (GA7:7/QCT 4). Instead, *techne* is a *mode of disclosure* in the light of which technical devices – ranging from ancient Greek swords to contemporary smart phones – can arise.

Maintaining that modern technology fulfills possibilities opened up 2500 years ago by ancient Greek metaphysics, Heidegger indicates that Aristotle's *Nichomachean Ethics* is crucial for understanding the essence of *techne*. Aristotle wrote that the *logos*-endowed human animal has two kinds of intellectual virtue: those involving knowing *that*, and those involving knowing *how*. The latter includes two modes of praxis: practical wisdom (*phronesis*) and *techne*. In ancient Greek, *techne* referred to the activity of the fine artist and poet, as well as the artisan. *Techne* requires foresight and knowledge in order to change one thing (for example, wood) into another (a table). Bringing forth an artifact envisioned by *techne* is called *poiêsis*. Plato indicated that *poiêsis* occurs in nature (*phusis*) as well, but Aristotle restricted *poiêsis* to human productive activity. Interpreting *poiêsis* in its broader sense, Heidegger states that "every bringing-forth [human and natural] is grounded in revealing" (GA7:13/QCT 12). Whereas natural entities are produced (brought forth) through themselves, artifacts are produced through others, that is, artists, artisans, and poets. Although *phusis* "is indeed *poiêsis* in the highest sense" (GA7:12/QCT 10), *techne* allows *phusis* to manifest itself in new modes. To reveal things through *techne*, human Dasein must already have some understanding of the being of things.

Aristotle posits that all *poiêsis* involves four "causes," material, efficient, formal, and final. Today, only *efficient* cause is still entertained. Heidegger reinterprets the four causes as "being responsible" for letting something come forth into presence and thus "to be." For example, an artisan first considers and discloses what is to be brought forth, and then cooperates with the necessary materials so that the artifact can emerge as initially envisioned. Rather than imposing the artisan's will, *techne* is an "occasioning" that lets something come forth. Just as Michelangelo "freed" the form slumbering in the marble, so too a woodworker lets the envisioned form arise

from the wood. "Thus what is decisive in *techne* does not at all lie in making and manipulating nor in the using of means, but rather in the aforementioned revealing. It is as revealing, and not as manufacturing, that *techne* is a bringing-forth" (GA7:14/QCT 13). Moreover, "every bringing-forth is grounded in revealing [*Entbergen*]," that is, *alêtheia* (GA7:13/QCT 12).

Although usually translated as "TRUTH," *alêtheia*'s literal meaning is unconcealment or disclosedness. Heidegger distinguishes four senses of unconcealment. First, unconcealment is required in everyday dealings with things, as when a doorknob *shows up as* a way of getting into the next room. Second, true assertions require unconcealment. To state correctly that "The snow is white" presupposes that the snow has already revealed itself to the one making the assertion. Third, unconcealment is involved in human activity, as when the artisan first envisions an artifact, and then lets it come into presence, into unconcealment. Such artisanal or artistic unconcealment, however, takes place within a more primal unconcealment: *alêtheia*, CLEARING, openness, or transcendence.

In *Being and Time*, which explores the interplay between manifesting (being) and absencing (*alêtheia*, unconcealment, clearing), Heidegger offers a phenomenological presentation of everyday human existence as revealed in a workshop. A human exists not as a subject confronting objects, but rather as immersive BEING-IN-THE-WORLD, always already utilizing the AVAILABLE equipment needed for this or that task. In everyday life, things show up *instrumentally*, as useful for human Dasein, the FOR-THE-SAKE-OF-WHICH of all productive activity. Absorbed in its work, Dasein does not notice either being (appearing, presencing) or TIME (temporal clearing), because they *conceal themselves* so that entities can show up *as* entities. If a tool breaks down or goes missing, however, Dasein's immersion in work is interrupted, and the referential totality of the world reveals itself. Stepping back from its "absorbed COPING" (Hubert Dreyfus), Dasein now discloses things as OCCURRENT objects with certain measurable features. This mode of disclosure is the basis for natural SCIENCE.

Being and Time refers only briefly to a non-instrumental, non-objectifying, poetic mode of disclosure. In everyday life, even NATURE shows itself as timber for cutting, or as wind bringing rain for crops. Instrumentality is depicted as a universal feature of fallen human Dasein. Later on, however, Heidegger maintained that today's wholly instrumentalist, exploitative disclosure of entities does not arise because of human FALLING, but rather from "the sending [or DESTINY] of being," *die Schickung des Seins*. Here, being does not mean the substantial essence of entities as in traditional metaphysics, but rather the event of disclosure itself. Human Dasein is appropriated (*vereignet*), even violently, as the clearing needed for entities to show up intelligibly *as* entities, and *in that sense* "be." What being means, that is, what it means for something to be, changes historically, from Plato's *eidos* to Nietzsche's will to power. The clearing (*die Lichtung*), sometimes synonymous with ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*), is said to "send" or "give" different senses of being. The discourse of "sending" suggests a "sender," but Heidegger contends that there is no "reason" (*Grund*) for the changes. Retrospectively, according to Heidegger, we can see that the clearing opened up through human existence has become increasingly constricted, such that in the techno-industrial era only exploitable aspects of entities can show up.

Heidegger's later view of technology was shaped by the writings of Ernst Jünger in the early 1930s. According to Jünger, twentieth-century humankind is "stamped" by the gestalt of the worker-soldier, and is thus the latest historical formation of what Nietzsche called the will to

power. As the planet is transformed into a titanic foundry for war matériel, soldiers and workers play interchangeable roles in a system that seeks ever-greater POWER for its own sake. Jünger embraced modern technology, but Heidegger found it much more difficult to do so. Raised in a village, he had experienced the wrenching social and cultural dislocations imposed by rapid German industrialization, as well as the gruesome consequences of mechanized warfare. He joined the Nazi party in 1933 because it seemingly promised the "new INCEPTION" needed to resist the cultural uprooting and nihilism brought about by global "MACHINATION" (GA65:124–29; also GA95:408.5ff.).

In his 1936 lecture course, Heidegger read Nietzsche as saying that ART could help establish a new mode of disclosure (world). Doing so, however, involves struggle and violence. A year earlier, glossing the first choral ode from *Antigone*, Heidegger had described Dasein as confronted by *dikê*, the overpowering order of *phusis*. Here, we must distinguish two such orders: first, the *phusis* understood *alêtheia*-logically sense, and second, the *phusis* understood *onto*-logically, or meta-physically. Heidegger does not always make the distinction. *Phusis* in its *alêtheia* sense delimits how entities can "be" (show up) *as* entities in a given historical era. *Phusis* in this sense cannot be mastered, because it *appropriates* us as the clearing needed for entities "to be" (show up as entities), in one way or another. *Phusis* in its *onto*-logical or metaphysical sense refers to being as the substantial presence of nature, to nature's enduring power embodied in the sea and wind, in animals and earth. To bring forth a meaningful world, Dasein must bring *phusis* (being understood metaphysically) to a stand through *techne*, which makes possible temples and poetry to orient human life. Yet, *Dasein* can undertake such world-formative *techne* and *poiêsis* only *within* the already-granted clearing (*alêtheia*-logical) that allows entities to show up *as* entities. Within the world opened up by and through them, the Greeks did violence against the powers of nature, by ensnaring animals and catching fish, by digging up the earth, and by engaging in relentless warfare against one another (GA40:153–73/153–91).

These remarks about the violence involved in world-formation and sustenance contrast with what Heidegger said two decades later, when comparing a sawmill in the Black Forest with a hydroelectric dam on the Rhine river, and a windmill with a nuclear power plant (GA7:8/QCT 5). Modern technology is today's prevailing mode of revealing, which *challenges* human Dasein to treat entities solely as instruments for producing power that is to be stored and redistributed; traditional technology cooperates with nature's processes. Heidegger sometimes depicts modern technology as "monstrous" for disclosing entities (that is, letting them "be") in this limited way, but as his discussion about ancient Greek Dasein makes clear, humankind engages in violence in order to wrest a historical world from resistant, self-concealing *phusis*, which he sometimes called "EARTH."

Even while valorizing ancient Greek Dasein, Heidegger maintains that Plato and Aristotle initiated the productionist metaphysics that led to techno-industrial NIHILISM. Modeling their concepts of being on handcraft production (consider Plato's eternal forms as blueprints for things, and Aristotle's account of things as formed matter), these thinkers concluded that for something "to be" means for it to be permanently *present*, and to be present means to have been *produced*. Subsequently, medieval theologians depicted God as the metaphysical ground and producer of all things. At the dawn of modern philosophy, however, Descartes posited the human subject as the ground of entities: for something to be now means for it to be an object (representation) produced by the self-grounding human subject. By adding striving and will to modern subjectivity, Leibniz paved the way for German Idealism's contention that will is central

to being, and thus for Nietzsche's claim that the will to power is the metaphysical ground. In short, Aristotle's "rational animal" (*zoon logon echon*) ends in Nietzsche's Overman, whom Heidegger often reads as the clever animal bent on world dominion. Heidegger's narrative of decline is strikingly opposed to Enlightenment modernity's narrative of historical progress.

In his 1936 lectures, Heidegger read Nietzsche in a positive light, for indicating that art may provide a way beyond nihilism. Within a few years, however, Heidegger concluded that Jünger was right: techno-industrial modernity is an expression of Nietzsche's idea of the will to power. Moreover, Heidegger contended that National Socialism was just another variant of the nihilism at work in Soviet Marxism and liberal capitalism. In the published version of his 1935 lecture course, *Introduction to Metaphysics*, Heidegger described the "inner truth and greatness" of National Socialism as "the encounter between global technology and modern humanity" (GA40:208/191). The meaning of the latter phrase, which was interpolated years later, remains contested.

Today's totally mobilized mode of being-in-the-world is correlated with the fact that entities show up as exploitable raw material. Just as Plato's philosophy was a response to how being (as *eidos*) addressed itself to him, so too modern technological activity is a response to how being now addresses itself to humankind (GA7:18/QCT 18). Heidegger warns that humankind risks losing its essential humanity, thus becoming reduced to what his student, Herbert Marcuse, would later call "one-dimensional man." In *Contributions to Philosophy*, Heidegger asserted that humankind is "bewitched" by "machination" (later, INVENTORY or SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT-(ION)ING, *Ge-Stell*), which calls for ever more intensive techno-industrial transformation of the planet (GA65:123–24). Fascinated with entities, modern Dasein risks what amounts to ontological damnation: in exchange for control over entities, we lose our "highest dignity," namely, guarding the unconcealment and concealment "of all coming to presence [being understood *alêtheia*-logically] on this earth" (GA7:33/QCT 32).

After World War II, Heidegger defined modern technology as a kind of *poiêsis* whose mode of unconcealment is "challenging" (*herausfordern*), by virtue of which entities show up as "STAND-ING RESERVE" (*Bestand*), stockpiled for further enhancing the techno-industrial system (GA7:15/QCT 14). When things are disclosed as standing reserve, they are no longer even objects for a subject. To name the technological ordering that gathers humankind and nature, Heidegger uses the term *Ge-Stell*, reminiscent of Jünger's *Gestalt*. *Ge-Stell* – the inventory – refers not to technical devices and to the socioeconomic structures that order them up, but instead to *techne*, "that mode of revealing which prevails in the essence of modern technology and which is itself nothing technological" (GA7:20–21/QCT 19–20). The inventory (*Ge-Stell*), the modern mode of *poiêsis*, forces things to come into unconcealment through being unlocked, transformed, stored, distributed, and switched around (GA7:17/QCT 16).

Heidegger denies that modern technology is merely an application of natural science. Instead, the inventory (*Ge-Stell*) governed modern mathematical science from the start, thereby preparing the way for modern technology two centuries later. In modern physics, "nature shows itself in some way or other that is identifiable through calculation and that remains orderable as a system of information" (GA7:24/QCT 23). Moreover, "steering [*Steuerung*] and securing even become the chief characteristic of the challenging revealing" (GA7:17/QCT 16). Steering is a central concept for cybernetics, the study of self-governing phenomena, from organisms to automata. Familiar with translations of Norbert Wiener's work on cybernetics, Heidegger envisioned that the inventory would generate a self-ordering technological system that could last for centuries, as it transforms everything into interchangeable data.

Although modern technology is our destiny, Heidegger claimed that we could develop a "free relation" to it. Such a relation could arise only if humans see that they exist as the clearing, the openness within which entities are *freed* to manifest themselves. A glimpse of our essential openness would reveal that the technological disclosure of things is neither natural nor inevitable, but rather a historical and thus temporary way of unconcealing entities. Things have manifested themselves otherwise in the past, and they can do so once again in the future. Insight into the temporary nature of the inventory (*Ge-Stell*) can give rise to "RELEASEMENT" (*Gelassenheit*), which allows us to twist free from it (see GA16:517–29/DT 43–57).

Catching a glimpse of our essence is difficult, because it belongs to the *self-concealing* interplay of presencing and absencing. As Heraclitus said: "*Phusis* loves to hide." Neither presencing nor absencing are things, but instead are NOTHING, no-thing, *das Nichts*. The essence of nihilism is not found in the decline of values and decadence, but rather in the ever-increasing concealment of the *nihil* – *das Nichts* – that constitutes our disclosive essence. Heidegger uses the term "abandonment of [entities by] being" (*Seinsverlassenheit*) to describe the evacuation of the meaningfulness of entities, which now show up in such constricted ways (see ABANDONMENT OF BEING).

Toward the end of "Die Frage nach der Technik," Heidegger glosses this line from Hölderlin: "Where the danger is, there the saving power grows" (GA7:29/QCT 28). Adaptation (*Ereignis*) gives rise to the "granting" that sends humankind into the dangerous mode of unconcealment called *Ge-Stell*, but that same granting may be understood as the saving power that lets humankind enter into its highest dignity, "keeping watch over unconcealment." Thrust into the inventory (*Ge-Stell*), we are exposed to the danger of losing our free essence. The inventory (*Ge-Stell*) and the saving power move past each other like two heavenly bodies, but "in such passing lies the hidden side of their nearness." Just when the situation seems bleakest, we may discern "the growing light of the saving power. What to do? We must foster the saving power in the little things, and this includes holding before our eyes the extreme danger." We must notice "what essences [*das Wesende*] in technology, instead of merely staring at the technological. So long as we represent technology as an instrument, we remain held fast in the will to master it, we press on past the essence of technology" (GA7:32–33/QCT 32–33).

If the essence of technology is nothing technological, reflecting on it must occur in a domain that is both akin to the essence of technology, but also fundamentally different from it. "Such a realm is art. But certainly only if reflection on art, for its part, does not shut its eyes to the constellation of truth [unconcealment] after which we are *questioning*." Of course, such questioning is never straightforward, because "the more questioningly we ponder the essence of technology, the more mysterious the essence of art becomes" (GA7:36/QCT 35).

In 1966 Heidegger granted to *Der Spiegel* an interview, published posthumously a decade later. He emphasized that the danger posed by the inventory (*Ge-Stell*) grows, precisely because of the "uncanny" fact that

> everything is functioning and that the functioning drives us to ever further functioning, and that technology tears men loose from the earth and uproots them. I don't know whether you were frightened, but I at any rate was frightened when I saw pictures coming from the moon to the earth. We don't need any atom bomb. The uprooting of man has already taken place. The only thing we have left is purely technological relationships. (GA16:669–70/105–06)

Faced with this danger, Heidegger concludes, "only a god can save us. The sole possibility that is left for us is to prepare a sort of readiness, through thinking and poetizing, for the appearance of the god or for the absence of the god in the time of foundering [*Untergang*]; for in the face of the god who is absent, we founder" (GA16:671/HC 107). By the new divinity Heidegger presumably means a new, world-organizing way in which entities can manifest themselves and thus "be." Granted by adaptation (*Ereignis*), such a new mode of manifesting would allow nature and humankind to reveal themselves in ways other than as mere means to the ends of modern technology.

Some critics maintain that such hope is misguided, given how few people are capable of catching a glimpse of the self-concealing interplay of presencing and absencing, which makes possible unconcealment in the first place. Having been preoccupied with understanding and maximizing control of entities for centuries, humankind seems inextricably wedded to expanding the reach of modern technology. Heidegger acknowledges this possibility, yet still holds out the prospect that the unexpected can happen. Perhaps humankind will be granted the possibility of DWELLING on the earth not in some imaginary harmony, but at least in a way that allows entities to reveal themselves more richly and multi-dimensionally than they do today.[1]

Michael E. Zimmerman

TEMPORAL PARTICULARITY (*JEWEILIGKEIT*). SEE MINENESS.

198.
TEMPORALITY (*TEMPORALITÄT, ZEITLICHKEIT*)

TEMPORALITY IS THE manner in which BEING in general, or DASEIN's being in particular, is conditioned by TIME. Heidegger uses *Temporalität* to refer to the former, and *Zeitlichkeit* to refer to the latter. *Because there is no natural English-language alternative to "temporality" with which to translate Temporalität* – "timeliness," for example, just means something different in English – I will here leave *Temporalität* and *Zeitlichkeit* in German.

Heidegger first introduces *temporal* and *Temporalität*[1] in the Logic lectures of 1924 (GA21), where he defines *temporal* to mean "characterized in terms of time." By *Being and Time*[2] he has specified the term to refer specifically to the temporal characterization of being:

> the SENSE of being and its characteristics and modes are originarily determined in terms of time [*aus der Zeit*], and we call this its *temporal* [*temporale*] determinateness. The fundamental ontological task of the interpretation of being as such hence includes working out the *Temporalität* of being. The concrete answer to the question of the sense of being is given for the first time [*allererst*] in the exposition of the problematic of *Temporalität*. (SZ 19)

Heidegger has told us that being is to be interpreted in terms of time (that time is the HORIZON of the understanding of being), and here we learn that the "characteristics and modes" of being that are salient in this interpretation are the *temporal* determinations of being. The language of *Temporalität* then does not reappear (in systematic use) in *Being and Time*, for as the plan of the treatise indicates, its analysis was to belong to the unwritten second part thereof.

In the Logic lectures he notes that in order to remain within the confines of a lecture series, he must examine *Temporalität* under the "dull and flickering light" of the inquiry into the temporal foundations of the proposition and of propositional TRUTH and falsity. Despite this narrow focus, we do learn that, insofar as they are illuminated by the light of the proposition, "being equals presence [*Anwesenheit*] and truth equals present [*Gegenwart*]" (GA21:206–07). Heidegger arrives at these theses by way of his interpretation of Aristotle's conception of truth, whose most basic form, he argues, is intuitive presence. It is for this reason that sensory awareness is always true: it simply *is* intuitive presence.

In *Basic Problems* Heidegger states that *Zeitlichkeit*, "insofar as it functions as the condition of the possibility of the understanding of being at all [*überhaupt*]," is called *Temporalität*. The adverb *überhaupt* indicates that *Temporalität* is the manner in which *being at large or in general*, being at all, is determined by time (GA24:389). That is, then, whereas *Zeitlichkeit* is the manner in which *Dasein*'s being is conditioned by time, *Temporalität* is the manner in which being

---

[1] Sheehan, in his translation of GA21, uses "urtemporal" for *temporal* (the adjective on which *Temporalität* is built). This, however, prejudges the proper interpretation of the relation between *Temporalität* and *Zeitlichkeit*.

[2] I will provide my own translations of Heidegger's texts.

(unrestricted) is conditioned by time. Conjoining the two statements, we see that being (unrestricted) is conditioned by time *because* Dasein's being is conditioned by time. (And this is surely explained by the thesis that being depends on the understanding of being, SZ 212, and retrospectively illuminates the methodological decision to approach being by way of the analysis of the understanding of being and the entity who understands being, namely, Dasein, SZ §2.)

In *Basic Problems* §21 we learn that *Temporalität* is the name for a system of *horizonal schemata* in terms of which being is understood. *Zeitlichkeit* is a structure of paired *ecstases* and horizonal schemata: the ecstases are the modes of temporal understanding, and the specific ways in which those modes of understanding interpret what they understand are their horizonal schemata (see Ecstasis). Heidegger is inspired to interpret the understanding of being this way by his reading of Kant's Schematism (*Critique of Pure Reason*), which explains why *Temporalität* emerges as a theme for the first time in the Logic lectures, which are heavily focused on Kant. The Schematism also lends Heidegger the vocabulary of "schemata."

The ecstasy of *enpresenting* is "being-open for *what confronts* [*Begegnendes*]" Dasein (GA24:436). What is it to confront Dasein? It is to be present (*anwesend*) to Dasein (see Presencing). To be present to Dasein is to be available in the present for Dasein's experiential encounter or practical manipulation. Heidegger denies that presence is the present, *die Gegenwart*, the present tense (GA24:434–35), and we may understand his denial to be a reminder that the past and future are themselves modes of presence, at least within the ordinary and traditional philosophical interpretation of being as Occurrentness. The past is what *was* present, and the future is what *will be* present.

Heidegger states in *Basic Problems* that presence (or *Praesenz*) is the temporal meaning of being *only insofar as being is understood as occurrentness* (in the widest sense, in which it subsumes Availableness, GA24:429). In *Being and Time* (SZ 11.4), he argues that the present ecstasy takes the leading role in our understanding of the occurrent in the widest sense, whereas the future ecstasy takes the leading role in our self-understanding. Thus, *Basic Problems* does *not* underwrite the thesis that being means presence, as some commentators have suggested (see Olafson 1998a). Heidegger gestures toward the task, but never works out the future-oriented alternative to *Praesenz*; the analysis implies, however, that there should be such an alternative.

After the mid-twenties Heidegger uses *Temporalität* only sporadically, and he either abandons or ignores the Kantian approach to the temporalized understanding of being that structures his analyses from the Logic lectures through *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics*.

William Blattner

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA21:§§18, 36–37; SZ 19; GA24:§§20–22

FURTHER READING

Blattner 1999, Carman 1995

199.
THEMATIC (*THEMATISCH*)

T HE VERB "to thematize" (*thematisieren*) means "to make something a topic (of discussion, or thought)." Something is *thematic* in the experience of an agent if and only if she is consciously focused on it. Something is *unthematic* (*unthematisch*) in the experience of an agent if and only if she is not focused on it, but still conscious of it. For example, if an agent grasps a doorknob while fleeing from a building which is on fire, she is not consciously focused on the doorknob, but rather on the fire. Yet she manages to see and grasp the doorknob, and handle it accurately: She is still minimally conscious of its usefulness for opening the door. In other words, while the fire is thematic for her, the doorknob is unthematic.

Heidegger uses this pair of "thematic" and "unthematic" for formulating two of his most significant theses: (1) the most important aspects of our experiences are unthematic for us; and (2) the task of (a proper) philosophy is precisely to make those unthematic aspects thematic, that is, to reflectively focus on what we have unreflectively taken for granted in our absorbed everyday actions.

The translation of these terms is unproblematic, because the English and the German terms share their roots in the Greek *théma*, originally meaning "assertion," or "statement." In German ordinary language, one might use the words *thematisch* and *thematisieren* (but not *unthematisch*) in (the German equivalents to) utterances such as "The movie 'Hope' thematizes the life of refugees," "We should thematize the time issues at the upcoming meeting," or "There is a thematic connection between Dostoyevsky's life and his books."

Sometimes, Heidegger just employs this ordinary usage of the terms "thematic" and "theme," stating, for instance, that "being is the proper and sole theme of philosophy" (GA24:15; emphasis omitted). Moreover, Heidegger occasionally uses the *ordinary* words in order to formulate a thesis concerning philosophical methodology: according to Heidegger, philosophers are often led astray by forgetting to thematize important issues. For instance, consider the famous problem that we might not really be sure that the external world exists because we could be brains in a vat. One might object that this question is ill phrased because it uncritically presupposes that we already know what we are talking about when speaking of an "external world." However, a more thorough philosophical investigation would *thematize* the notion of an "external world," wonder what it means that a world can show up in experience, and thereby – maybe – start dissolving the original problem. In this spirit, Heidegger is very interested in which assumptions either have been taken for granted or have been thematized by traditional philosophers (see, e.g., SZ 24). Most famously, of course, Heidegger claims that traditional philosophers have forgotten to thematize BEING (*Sein*, SZ 2, 4).

Yet the most important usages of the terms "thematic" and "thematize" are those where Heidegger uses them in a *technical* way, in the way already mentioned at the beginning. It is very likely that Heidegger has borrowed these technical notions of "thematic" and "unthematic" from Husserl. Thus, it is worth having a look at how Husserl uses these terms.

Husserl employs his technical "thematic"/"unthematic" distinction in several works, for instance in *Ideas I* (Husserl 1976), but also in *Ideas II* (Husserl 1952) and in *Experience and Judgment* (*Erfahrung und Urteil*, Husserl 1939). The two last mentioned works trace back to a manuscript Husserl started working on in 1912, and to lectures given in 1910–14 and in 1919–20. Even though these works have been published only posthumously, Heidegger acknowledges his familiarity with the manuscript of *Ideas II* and with Husserl's lectures in *Being and Time* (SZ 47 fn. 1). According to Husserl's technical notion, an agent can develop an interest in an object (Husserl 1939, §20) and then consciously focus on it, look at it attentively (*ibid.*, 175), and take it into her "thematic grasp" (*ibid.*, 163). For example, a particular flower in a flower bed can stand out as extremely interesting, so that the agent pays all her attention to this flower (*ibid.*, 147). Husserl holds that this attentive thematization occurs only occasionally, but that it is crucial for philosophy (*ibid.*, 67; my translation):

> the Ego, concretely living in its surrounding world, indulged in its practical aims, is by no means mainly a contemplating Ego. For the Ego in its concrete "life-world," contemplating an entity is an attitude which it can adopt occasionally and temporarily, but which is not outstanding. But the later philosophical reflection on the structure of the world of immediate experience shows that contemplating perception is outstanding insofar as it discloses and thematizes structures of the world which ground all practical behavior, even though they are not constantly thematic.

If the word "Ego" in the quote were replaced with "DASEIN," Heidegger could not agree more: most aspects of our experiences in action are not thematic – are unthematic – but philosophy can make these unthematic structures of our experiences thematic. These are ideas that are shared by Husserl and Heidegger. But there is also a crucial difference. Like Husserl, Heidegger holds that there are two ways of understanding objects, a thematic and an unthematic one. But Husserl thinks that the unthematic way of cognizing objects is basically an implicit, preliminary form of the thematic understanding (Husserl 1939, 265) – and this is where Heidegger disagrees …

These technical notions of "thematic" and "unthematic" do not yet show up in Heidegger's early writings (GA1), but they play an important role in *Being and Time* and in related works (e.g., GA20, GA21, GA24). A central pair of ideas in *Being and Time* is that most of our actions proceed unreflectively and consist in an ongoing interaction with our surrounding world: We always already understand this surrounding world as practically meaningful, without being thematically aware that we understand it in this way. Heidegger expresses these thoughts as follows:

> when we enter here through the door, we do not apprehend the seats as such, and the same holds for the doorknob. Nevertheless, they are there in this peculiar way: we go by them circumspectly, avoid them circumspectly, stumble against them, and the like. Stairs, corridors, windows, chairs and bench, blackboard, and much more are not given thematically. We say that an equipmental contexture environs us. Each individual piece of equipment is by its own nature equipment for – for traveling, for writing, for flying. (GA24:232f.)

As far as the notions of "thematic" and "unthematic" are concerned, several points are remarkable about these ideas. To begin with, it is important to notice that we do not have to think about

most aspects of our actions. For example, when we are entering our university, we just find our room without paying attention to it – we can focus completely on the work to come. This is an important idea, because it arguably contrasts with many of today's mainstream views on action, according to which human behavior consists paradigmatically in actions which are guided by contentful intentions.

But it is crucial not to confuse the pair "thematic"/"unthematic" with pairs such as "conscious"/"unconscious" or "intentional"/"automatic." "Unthematic" does not mean "unconscious" or "automatic." Even in our everyday unreflective actions, we do experience our surrounding world in a particular way. Heidegger analyzes this by saying that our everyday actions are guided by CIRCUMSPECTION, by a *practical* kind of COGNITION. Our surrounding world shows up as having a certain structure, as consisting of tools and equipment which we understand in relation to what we can do with them. For example, we might not (thematically) see a doorknob as a metallic object of a certain size, but we can experience it as inviting or demanding to open the door. According to Heidegger, even in this kind of unreflective everyday action, we are interpreting our surrounding world by seeing something *as* something – but this AS-STRUCTURE is not thematic, so that we can have the impression that we "directly" see a chair, or a bench (SZ 149f.; GA21:145; see also UNDERSTANDING and INTERPRETATION).

Heidegger holds that we always already understand our surrounding worlds in the mentioned way – but before engaging in phenomenology, most of us do not know about this: "this understanding of equipmentality … is hidden to us, is unthematic, non-objective, pre-conceptual" (GA25:22f.; cf. SZ 69). This idea runs parallel to a thought from current epistemology: In order to know something, we do not need to know that we know it. For example, a person might know how to be persuasive, but not know about his knowing-how, because he considers himself shy.

What is Heidegger's view on the contrasting term, on "thematic"? From a systematic point of view, it makes sense to assume that there is a *practical* thematizing: Even in our everyday actions, we might occasionally consciously focus on certain aspects. For example, imagine an agent who is visiting Rome as a tourist and rides her bicycle through the traffic in its inner city: She has to be highly consciously focused on many things, but this kind of thematizing is all practical. Husserl clearly acknowledges that there is practical thematizing (Husserl 1952, 13, 219). And even though Heidegger is not entirely clear on this, there are passages where he also seems to accept the existence of practical thematizing (SZ 111f., 120, 124; GA20:265).

But for the purposes of engaging in philosophy, *theoretical* thematizing is more important. Heidegger characterizes theoretical thematizing in this way:

> the scientific sketch of the always already somehow encountered entities allows for understanding their mode of being explicitly. . . . We shall call all this sketching *thematization*, comprising the articulation of the understanding of being, the corresponding definition of the subject area, and the development of preliminary concepts appropriate for the entities. . . . Thematization objectifies. It does not "postulate" entities, but "sets them free," so that they can be interrogated and determined. (SZ 363; cf. GA86:878)

The idea is this: If a philosopher engages in theoretical thematization, she tries to focus explicitly on the unthematic ways of understanding which are implicitly present in our everyday actions. But according to (many passages in) Heidegger, this implicit understanding is

preconceptual: We understand what a hammer is if we know how to use it. A deaf-mute craftsman with forty years of experience might understand a hammer best. Yet if we want to understand the *understanding*, we do need concepts. And according to Heidegger, it is the task of philosophy to sketch, draw, and develop these concepts. In this sense, philosophy objectifies aspects of our experience – it develops new concepts, so that what is referred to by these concepts can become an object of investigation. For example, the concept "availableness" objectifies certain, very crucial aspects of our experience, and availableness can thus become an object of philosophical inquiry. But of course, this sense of objectification must not be confused with reification. Availableness is an object for philosophical study, but not a thing: the concept just refers to aspects of our experience in everyday action (see AVAILABLENESS).

There is not much discussion of the concepts "thematic" and "unthematic" in the literature on Heidegger. Robert Brandom reads *Being and Time* as a sort of fore-runner of *Making it Explicit*, arguing that thematizing is a linguistic practice which is essential for Dasein (Brandom 2002a). In a short reply, John Haugeland is very critical of Brandom's reading (Haugeland 2005). Still, both papers are very helpful in conjunction, because they point to many important systematic and exegetical questions concerning thematizing: Is thematizing always linguistic? Can there be a human being who never thematizes anything? Is the ability to thematize just something on a second "layer," added onto a first layer of unthematic experience in everyday action? Or, is thematizing necessary for Dasein? From an exegetical point of view, answering these questions is not easy, as this would also depend on how Heidegger uses other concepts such as DISCOURSE (*Rede*), LANGUAGE (*Sprache*), or "Dasein." In any case, this shows how deeply the concepts of "thematic" and "unthematic" are interwoven into Heidegger's conceptual network, a network which Heidegger gained by thematizing.[1]

Martin Weichold

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

thematisch (technical term) SZ 2, 10, 15, 16, 24, 25, 31, 35, 43, 48, 68, 69, 72, 75, 111, 112, 120, 124, 130, 131, 149, 150, 161, 164, 231, 268, 286, 301, 312, 324, 336, 354, 361, 363, 422, 436; GA3:27, 47, 96, 98, 123, 145; GA9:73/58; GA15:362/FS 58; GA16:684; GA17:14; GA18:155, 163, 344; GA19:55, 57, 208, 600, 648; GA20:70, 88, 253, 263, 265, 281, 351, 361, 382, 396, 407, 414; GA21:144, 145, 146, 147, 154, 155, 156, 159, 160, 275, 286, 288, 294, 296, 305, 360, 383, 391, 397, 400, 415; GA23:22, 26, 238; GA25:36, 38, 92, 356; GA26: 35, 259; GA27:200; GA31:53, 58; GA46:313; GA55:313, 337; GA59:4; GA62:187, 345, 346, 364, 368; GA63:1; GA64:40, 47, 74; GA66:376; GA69:152; GA73.2:1225, 1280, 1291, 1381, 1418, 1442; GA77:75; GA86:394, 785, 878

nicht thematisch (not thematic) SZ 69, 145, 336, 353 417; GA3:20, 96, 120, 144, 151; GA20:55, 153, 349; GA25:222; GA32:91; GA35:168; GA62:117; GA63:16; GA73.2:1320

unthematisch (unthematic) SZ 31, 74, 75, 76, 83, 112, 324, 356, 364, 408, 409, 415, 421; GA3:47, 48, 123, 145, 151, 160; GA15:362/FS 58; GA20:354; GA21:146, 158, 275, 278, 283, 286, 288, 294, 296, 297, 299, 338, 339, 341, 345, 346, 377, 395, 399, 400, 401; GA23:36, 199; GA25:23; GA26:259, 260; GA73.2:1285, 1415; GA77:76; GA86: 371

vorthematisch (not yet thematic) SZ 67; GA63:96

außerthematisch (outside the thematic) SZ 67; GA31:11

200.

THERE (*DA*)

T HE THERE IS a situation that essentially locates whatever belongs to the there. In German, *da* is an indexical pronoun expressing a location: *there* in contrast to *here* (*hier*) or *over there* (*dort*). As *da* serves as prefix to *-sein* (*being*) in DASEIN, Heidegger begins to consider "there" (*da*) a philosophical notion in itself, treating it as a proper noun by beginning it with a capital letter and combining it with a definite article, thus using grammar to create a new philosophical concept: *the there* (*das Da*).

The peculiar function of that notion of the there is inseparable from its counterpart, Dasein. This is most directly but vaguely expressed in Heidegger's ontological discourse: to exist as Dasein just *means* to be the there. Heidegger therefore often combines or identifies both the there and Dasein by hyphenating the latter as Da-sein, drawing attention to what makes that being particular. In other, more specific passages, Heidegger also clearly distinguishes both. These cases are not limited to a specific period of Heidegger's works; the there is not a linguistic oddity of later Heidegger but is present already before *Being and Time* only to remain a continuous concern until the very late seminars.

There is no single determining context or problem the notion of the there addresses; rather, the discussions scattered throughout Heidegger's work occur in very different contexts. Three central themes can be identified: (1) to be "there" is equivalent to being phenomenally *present*, to be an object of possible experience *at all*, it is equivalent for something to *be*; (2) indicating something as belonging to the there expresses a complex structural *unity* of (co-constitutive) elements on a single level of analysis; (3) genuinely being the there constitutes a *normative* standard for human beings.

What unites these different discussions is the idea that *Dasein* qua "there" is essentially *located* or *situated*; the indexical pronoun, because it expresses a location, can be taken to indicate such an orientation toward what human beings are in each case engaged with. "The there" serves as an indication of the place in which a subject's experience takes place and agents are confronted with normative demands. Discussions of the there attempt to address this situated and situational condition of the possibility for all meaningful experience.

(1) Heidegger repeatedly broaches the peculiar importance of the there through every day uses of the pronominal: "to be there" (*da sein*) means "to be (spatially) close" or "to be at a (specifiable) location." "The there" can thus come to describe the place or domain *in* which something is accessible to experience or to action at all. This is most evident in passages where Heidegger describes something being *in* the there (*im Da*) or coming *into* the there (*in das Da kommen*): that it is *in* the there does not pick out any particular location but merely the fact *that* it appears somewhere, in a situation or context that can be further specified.

Consequently, but in contrast to the semantics of everyday use, saying of an experience that it belongs to the there is prior to any form of spatiality: if to be *here* or to be *over there* are different ways *how* entities are present, they already presuppose the there as condition and characteristic of their very presence as such. Heidegger repeatedly makes this point: "'Here' and 'over there'

are possible only in a 'there,' that is, when there is a being which has disclosed spatiality as the being of the there" (SZ 132). "The word 'there' is not the name for designating a place, be it in a specific or a generic manner; rather, the 'there' names the CLEARING within which both a spatiotemporal order of positions and SPACE and TIME in the usual sense can be posited at all" (GA49:61). "The over-there [*dort*] is a there, too, more precisely: it is in the there [*im Da*]" (GA71:211).

In *Being and Time*, the there is discussed at the beginning of Division 1, chap. 5, "Being-in as Such." Dasein's BEING-IN-THE-WORLD is here specified as existing *in* "the there." Other notions used in *Being and Time* to describe the there as the domain of possible experience include "discoveredness" (*Entdecktheit*), "DISCLOSEDNESS" (*Erschlossenheit*), and the "CLEARING" (*Lichtung*), the latter in particular articulating the idea of a region of meaningfulness. Despite their differences, these notions have in common that a domain is identified as transcendental condition of possible experience. Talking about the there of Dasein is a way to broach the link between the very possibility of experience and the quasi-spatial form of experience prefigured in the words' semantics.

The relation between the possibility of experience and objects of experience is also expressible by talking about the being-there of entities. The lecture course *Basic Concepts of Aristotelian Philosophy* (GA18) is a good example of this use of the there. Here, Heidegger defines Aristotelian concepts as different modes of being "there": enumerating characteristics of substance or essence (*ousia*), which can be translated into German as Dasein, Heidegger names these "*fully determinate characters of the sense of the there*" representing "*a determinate conception of the there*" (GA18:33/24, cf. 346–52/234–38). Other Aristotelian notions relate to the there as well: having a determinate limit (*peras*) is a "basic character of the there" (GA18:40/29); movement (*kinesis*) is a possible "there-mode of entities" (GA18:379/256) and "how of the there" (GA18:379/257); LIFE (*zoe*) and happiness (*eudaimonia*) are other modes of such being there (GA18:353/239).

If phenomena belonging to such different categories can be differentiated as *modes* of being "there," the there should not be taken as what singles out human beings among entities (Dasein in the sense of *Being and Time*). As being in the world, human access to the world is rather already inextricably bound to the domain in which it finds itself. In particular, as phenomenal presence prior to any modalities, something being simply "there" is the phenomenal correlate of the fact *that* something exists, i.e., the correlate of its mere *being*. Although this perspective is not dominant in *Being and Time*, where being is described in terms of time rather than space, later Heidegger can explicitly describe the there as the genuine appearance of being itself: "The word 'there,' the 'there' means just this clearing for being. It is the essence of Da-sein to *be* this 'there.' The human being takes it on itself to be the there insofar as it exists" (GA49:60–61).

This thought, however, is largely congruent with Heidegger's identification of the there with disclosedness already present in *Being and Time*: By virtue of being in-the-world, Dasein "bears in its ownmost being the character of not being closed [*Unverschlossenheit*]. The expression 'there' means … essential disclosedness" (SZ 132, cf. 143). Despite its variations, Heidegger can thus lay claim to continuity in his thinking of the there: "The there in *Being and Time* does not mean a statement of place but rather it should designate the openness where entities can be present for the human, and the human being also for himself" (Zoll 157/120). As such indeterminate openness, "the there" conditions any possible correlation of the subjective and the objective, of Dasein and entities.

(2) In *Being and Time*, "the there" is often used to designate the experiential or phenomenal *unity* of the different moments revealed as peculiar to the human. This becomes clear in the discussion of the there that opens Division 1, chap. 5 of *Being and Time*: Heidegger is about to explore a diverse range of aspects of the ontological constitution of Dasein; because there is neither a hierarchy between these aspects nor a conceptual or substantial center to them, phenomena revealed to be intrinsically related to Dasein cannot be deduced from its concept nor relate to it like predicates to a subject or properties to a substance. All of its traits rather are "existentially equiprimordial" (see EQUIPRIMORDIALITY) in contrast to being derived from any "primordial ground" (SZ 131): all its existential determinations are part and parcel of the there as the structured unity of human existence.

The there of Dasein thus identifies the form or medium within which phenomena are revealed as belonging to the "primordial" unity of its constitution. Consequently, the there is that which every instance or characteristic of Dasein "by its very nature … brings … along with it" (SZ 133). In its more general expressions in an ontological register, however, this idea either borders on a tautology or appears to be hopelessly circular: the being of Dasein is "the fact that it *is* in the mode of being its there" (SZ 133). Taken out of context, remarks such as these may appear empty.

Outside such general remarks, however, the there functions as an important operative notion in *Being and Time*, indicating that a phenomenon under discussion is also to be situated at the "primordial" level in the analysis of Dasein and is part of the complex unity of its "equiprimordial" traits. Heidegger thus repeatedly refers to the there in the analysis of the different aspects of disclosedness (DISPOSEDNESS, UNDERSTANDING, DISCOURSE). The beginning of §31 offers an example of how the there is operative here: "disposedness is *one* of the existential structures in which the being of the 'there' dwells. Equiprimordially with it, *understanding* constitutes this being…. [P]rimary understanding [is] co-constituting [*mitkonstituierend*] the being of the there in general" (SZ 142–43).

(3) The there also assumes a peculiar normative function with respect to human being. In *Being and Time*, "to be their there" (SZ 133) is identified as that with which all Dasein, according to its canonical definition in the introduction (SZ 12), is "concerned in its being" (SZ 133). To be the there is what Dasein "takes … on itself" (GA49:61). "The there" thus designates not only the complex unity of what HUMAN BEING qua Dasein essentially is; as such, it is also what human beings should commit to and try to be.

This idea is most directly expressed in the discussion of truth in *Being and Time*. Here, "being the there" (*das Da sein*) comes to express an existential orientation toward truth: disclosedness is not only "the basic character of Dasein in accordance with which it *is* its there" (SZ 220) but also the "most primordial phenomenon of truth" (SZ 221). Although Dasein is both disclosed (*erschlossen*) and "closed off" (*verschlossen*, SZ 222), i.e., both "in truth" and "in untruth" (SZ 222), precedence is of course to be given to what is ("primordially") true and to a true (authentic) way to live. Therefore, if the analyses in Division II of *Being and Time* advance the idea that truth as disclosedness can lead to RESOLUTENESS (*Entschlossenheit*), such resoluteness will include heightened awareness for what is in the there in a given situation: "when resolute, Dasein has brought itself back out of FALLING in order to be all the more authentically 'there'" (SZ 328).

The normative outlook of being-there is given particular emphasis in *Contributions to Philosophy*, where the "unfolding of the thereness of the 'there'" (GA65:211) is a central theme in the fifth part on "Grounding" (*Gründen*) in particular. Here, a contrast term to

being the there is developed, namely being "away" (*weg*). Recasting the discussion of AUTHEN-TICITY and inauthenticity in *Being and Time*, "being-away" (*Weg-sein*) is now said to be the "more *original term* for the *inauthenticity of Da-sein*" (GA65:324). Just like inauthenticity and fallenness (Dasein living "*away from itself*," SZ 179), the failure to be "there" is part of the human condition: "the human being is the *away* [*das Weg*]" (GA65:323) But because it sets the standard for what it even means to exist as a human being, the possibility to be present in a situation, to be there, retains a certain prevalence over being-away or being-absent (*Abwesendsein*) (GA29/30:94–99; cf. GA34:27–28).

How, according to *Contributions*, a transformation of being-away to genuine being-there might be achieved is not fully clear. Heidegger emphasizes that only by being responsive to the demands of the historical situation can a true Da-sein be gained (GA65:309). Here as well as in the earlier account in *The Basic Problems of Metaphysics*, "awakening" a "fundamental mood" (*Grundstimmung*) is decisive (GA29/30:95) for such genuine access to one's there. Yet Heidegger in different passages takes different moods to be capable of such transformation: ANXIETY, BOREDOM, and RESTRAINT (*Verhaltenheit*), among others.

Tobias Keiling

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

there and space GA20:349; SZ 132; GA66:321
there and clearing SZ 133; GA49:61
there and self GA65:322

FURTHER READING

Malpas 2006, 175–83, Backman 2015, Overgaard 2004, 190–201

THEMATIC OBJECT (*GEGENSTAND*). SEE OBJECT.

THERE-BEING (DASEIN). SEE DASEIN.

THERENESS (*VORHANDENHEIT*). SEE OCCURRENTNESS.

THEY, THE (*DAS MAN*). SEE ANYONE, THE.

THING (*SACHE*). SEE MATTER, THE.

THING (*GEGENSTAND*). SEE OBJECT.

201.
THING (*DING*)

"Thing" can mean (1) an occurrent, obtrusive object, (2) an entity in general, or (3) a special kind of focal entity that gathers or draws together human practices, integrating them into the local earth, sky, and forms of receptivity to the divine.

I PERIODS, PROBLEMS, AND PRELIMINARY DEFINITIONS

Philosophical and poetic reflection upon the thing (*das Ding*) – not to be confused with *Sache* (affair, matter, or subject-matter, as in Husserl's famous phenomenological slogan "To the things themselves") – runs like a guiding thread throughout the course of Heidegger's thought, and accompanies the question of BEING (*Seinsfrage*) like its shadow. As the sense of Heidegger's basic question (concerning the SENSE and, eventually, the TRUTH of being) changes, so do the status and significance of things in Heidegger's ontological reckoning. It is helpful to distinguish between three phases in the career of the thing, and Heidegger's corresponding definitions of "thing," in keeping with enduring scholarly opinion regarding the stages in the development of Heidegger's *Denkweg* and in line with fairly clearly discernible shifts within the Heideggerian corpus.[1]

In the early years, the thing shows up as an unwelcome (objective) intrusion in an otherwise meaningful engagement with the surrounding WORLD (*Umwelt*). The earliest extant lecture courses (1919–23) single out the thing as the result of various acts of objectification, which culminate in the reification of modern physical SCIENCE, which stands at the center of neo-Kantian epistemology and "philosophy of consciousness." In this setting, the thing is more or less equivalent to what in SZ Heidegger calls the occurrent, i.e., the formerly meaningful item (e.g., a tool) stripped of its function, and torn out of its context of AFFORDANCES, and consequently no longer part of our ongoing efforts to cope with practical affairs and, more generally, to make sense of the world in which we find ourselves thrown (by way of such activities as religious worship, political involvement, or the experience of art). In this register, to be a thing is to be a mere object (of disinterested, theoretical contemplation). The problem throughout the years leading up to SZ is to find philosophically adequate ways of doing justice to human life as concerned and caring, and to speak of what we experience accordingly, as creatures for whom things matter.

As Heidegger continues to explore the possibility of an enriched ontology of significant experiences and their targets and background conditions, the concept of the thing comes to be

---

[1] The literature on Heidegger's development is too large to record at any length here. The obvious place to begin is Richardson 1963. More recently, Thomas Sheehan has argued in Sheehan 2015 for a single-minded focus throughout Heidegger's development. For our purposes, we can distinguish between an early "transcendental" or "essentialist" phase, worked out under the influence (in or around 1925) of Kant; a middle period, involving the discovery of the implications of truth as unconcealment, and the turn to National Socialism and a corresponding "political" ontology; and a final phase, dominated by the thought of a possible new beginning, beyond metaphysics, in which Heidegger ostensibly works his way free of the political narrowness of the historically oriented thinking of his middle period.

detached from the concept of an indifferent object, and becomes a genuine problem for philosophical thought. This renewed and more open-ended interrogation of the thing finds expression in the final version of "The Origin of the Work of Art" (1936)[2] and in an important course of lectures held during the winter semester of 1935/36, originally entitled *Basic Questions of Metaphysics* and subsequently published as *The Question Concerning the Thing*. Throughout these two texts, closely related in both time and topic, Heidegger ties the very history of philosophy (or metaphysics; see History of Being) to the ontological vicissitudes of the thing (here *Ding* is probably equivalent to entity, *Seiende*); and he appears to grant, at least by implication, that his own earlier dismissal of the thing-paradigm is anchored in a deficient or occluding tradition, which fails to incorporate the significance (what Heidegger will eventually call the "gathering" power) of what reveals itself in things *beyond our practical involvements* as well as our theoretical comportments. At this stage "the thing" might be defined, or formally indicated, as "what the entity is *to be* determined *as*, on the basis of rich historical and ontological reflection."

In the later period (we might call this the period of the thing proper), the thing comes to be defined, under the acknowledged influence of Hölderlin, and in opposition to Nietzsche's philosophy of the "will to power," as the gathering point or focus of what Heidegger calls "the fourfold" (*Geviert*) – earth, sky, divinities, mortals – in a sort of poetic ontology of what there is, beyond metaphysics in general, and the metaphysics of subjectivity in particular. This is also the period of Heidegger's most intense engagement with technology as a way of disclosing entities, and his thoughts on the thing bear close ties to his views on *Ge-Stell* ("positionality," "enframing," or, more simply, "the framework"; see Inventory and Synthetic Com-posit(ion)ing). One of the chief problems of this period is to find ways of talking about and experiencing things that promise a more meaningful life and speech in the midst of a technological and scientific culture, where entities have come to be little more than what Heidegger calls "standing reserve," mere "resource" or "stand-by" (*Bestand*) in an endless cycle of meaningless activity or technical and economic business (*Betrieb*).[3]

The Early Years

Heidegger's phenomenological strategy throughout the early years is largely polemical (a matter of *Neinsagen*, as he puts it in an early account of deconstruction or *Destruktion*, GA58:148; GA59:171): Engaged and personal encounter, for instance, is pitted against detached speculation, religion as experience of the holy against the impersonal, objective philosophy of religion and history of religion, Aristotelian science of life against Husserlian phenomenology of mere consciousness, astrophysics and reductive materialism against the evidence of ancient tragedy.[4] The terms of the debate often change, but one theme, or preoccupation, reigns supreme, in the form of the question: How should entities be taken up, interpreted, and spoken about, if their meaning and mattering, their *weight* are to be preserved, against a pervasive philosophical and scientific tendency to drain things and their settings and surroundings of their sense and significance, in

---

[2] The essay can be traced back to 1931, but the concept of the thing shows up only later.

[3] It is, of course, somewhat misleading to speak of a technological "culture," as Heidegger understands technology as a global way in which beings themselves become manifest.

[4] See, inter alia, the lecture courses on the phenomenology of religious life (GA60) and the first sustained critique of Husserlian phenomenology, which offers the first "etymological" account of phenomenology, with reference to Aristotle, in WS 1923–24 (GA17).

favor of more neutral, objective modes of disclosure? Heidegger purports to discover one predominant mode of articulating the being of entities, which he contrasts with a richer and more significant way of having entities in experience and speech – in a tale of two suns, or tables, walls or jugs (for science and theory, on the one hand, for life and poetry and practice, on the other).[5]

Heidegger's earliest extant reflection upon the thing, in KNS 1919, gives rise to a simple but pregnant contrast between the sorts of things we experience in everyday practical life and the same things as they show up in neutralizing scientific discourse. We don't have the space here to sketch out the context within which Heidegger introduces this distinction, but a few points can be drawn out of the earliest extant lecture courses (KNS 1919 and WS 1919–20 especially) that transcend the local concerns that animate Heidegger's project at this stage in its development, concerning (a) how we arrive at the very idea of the thing; (b) what the account of the thing leaves out of focus; and (c) why it should matter, both to phenomenology and for the sake of a meaningful life, that (objective) things have come to dominate the philosophical discussion of what exists.

Regarding (a): Heidegger's earliest thoughts about the thing emerge out of an interest in the scientific disclosure of entities and the relationship between scientific interests and the motives and tendencies that live in pre-scientific life, with the overarching aim of motivating a philosophy that takes pre-scientific or pre-theoretical experience as its point of departure and abiding soil. In an important stretch of the argument in KNS 1919, Heidegger draws a pregnant distinction – arguably fundamental for his entire development[6] – between what he calls *Umwelterlebnis* and *Dingerfahrung*: The latter is the sort of experience we have when things are allowed to *mean*, when, for instance, the philosopher's lectern is construed as the place where the teacher speaks about something he cares about to students who care as well, while the former is what we get when we adopt a theoretical or merely epistemological attitude that sees only brute objects in a field of indifferent consciousness (GA56/57:§§13–17). In the epistemological frame of mind, the lectern is reduced to a complex of sense data, which may or may not relate to something outside of the viewer's own consciousness of the sensations normally, and rightly, embedded in the meaningful item of environmental experience.[7] In a pregnant turn of phrase that anticipates a decade of more detailed existential phenomenology to come, Heidegger suggest that the (meaningless) thing shows up as the correlate of *un-living* (*Entlebung*) (see GA56/57:84–94; GA58:75–78). There are things, then, when and where a life no longer appears to mean: The appearance of the thing comes at the expense of the (meaningful) world.

Regarding (b): What is left out of the picture in the theoretical preoccupation with mere things is nothing less than the *meaningful* thing: the tool, the significant space or place, persons and their "self-living" (*Selbstleben*), and the meaningful natural phenomenon.[8] In a move that Heidegger will make again and again over the course of the next four decades, the (mere) thing is set against the thing as it shows in our best, most engaged and correspondingly thoughtful, light. The examples vary (the sun, a flower-strewn meadow in May, and a choral mass by Bach, GA58:53; a table in Heidegger's cabin in the Black Forest, GA63:88–92; a wall, posited by

---

[5] For the earliest version of the strategy, a veritable staple throughout Heidegger's development, of contrasting meaningful and meaningless experiences and descriptions of things, see §15 of KNS 1919 (GA56/57:73–76), which contrasts the sun as it shows in Sophocles' *Antigone* and the sun for astrophysics.

[6] See Kisiel's path-breaking *The Genesis of Heidegger's Being and Time*, Kisiel 1993, 21. For more detail on the first Freiburg period, see Reid 2005.

[7] Experiences, or descriptions of experience, of this sort generate pseudo-problems like that of the reality of the external world. See REALITY.

[8] The concepts of "self-living" and the world of the self find their earliest sustained elaboration in WS 1919–20 (GA58).

Fichte, poetically disclosed by Rilke, GA24:243–47), but the message is roughly the same: we are in danger of reducing things that matter to the uninspiring and no longer meaningful precipitate of various acts of theoretical thought, which make over, for instance, the table where Heidegger's wife and children do their thing in an image of sense data organized under a concept (Husserl, on Heidegger's view, under the influence of neo-Kantianism and the burgeoning empirical psychology of late nineteenth-century thought) or the Platonic form of the table *as such* (devoid of personal meaning and inflection).[9]

Regarding (c): The question concerning why we should care about "reification" represents an enduring preoccupation throughout Heidegger's philosophical development. Already in the early period Heidegger's answer appears strongly tied to dissatisfaction with life under what Weber called the "iron cage" of scientific rationality, which disenchants the world and consigns meaning and "value" to the arbitrary preferences of evaluating subjects. Heidegger's early dissatisfaction with the thing-paradigm begins to express a now commonplace dissatisfaction with late modernity and the technological appropriation of the thing as resource in a vast network of forces, with no clearly identifiable noble or worthwhile aim.[10]

A Period of Transition

The language of the thing shows up again, centrally and in a comparatively novel light, in two important texts from the 1930s: "The Origin of the Work of Art" and the closely related lecture course *The Question Concerning the Thing* both insist that (1) the question concerning the thing is no longer taken to be decidedly answered (the thing is, like being itself, a question for philosophy);[11] (2) the being of the thing must be interpreted in light of the history of philosophy as a whole; and (3) ontology itself must decide the very thingness of the thing. What an extant or historical philosophy has to say about the thing reveals something of the very nature of the metaphysical enterprise; and a renewal of philosophy ought to involve rethinking the being of the thing itself.

The reader is struck, first of all, by Heidegger's willingness to reconsider the being of the thing, beyond the more dismissive remarks characteristic of the earlier period. Heidegger now seems to position his own, newly burgeoning ontology in terms of the thing's status. This may prove little more than a terminological shift, as reflection upon the nature or being of entities (now things) has been a mainstay for at least a decade. But it is at least remarkable that Heidegger makes the thing and the tradition of interpreting the thing central to his sense of both his own project and, crucially, his approach to the history of philosophy.

Heidegger now considers it necessary to take into account the traditional interpretations of the thing in the history of philosophy. In a way, then, what Heidegger eventually calls the "history of being" might be said to begin as a history of interpretations of what it means to be a thing (as the instantiation of an idea, in the ancient world of Platonic

---

[9] The ancients and the moderns are, in short, guilty of ignoring what Heidegger calls "FACTICITY."

[10] The account of the occurrent in SZ represents the culmination of Heidegger's developing conception of the thing throughout the early period, and offers nothing new beyond the temporal interpretation of the phenomenon in Division II. For references to the thing in SZ, see Jaran and Perrin 2013, vol. 1, 298.

[11] This comes out more clearly in WS 1935–36 (GA41) than in the essay on the *Kunstwerk*. An early, published version of WS 1935–36 was translated by Barton and Deutsch as *What Is a Thing?* A more recent translation by James D. Reid and Benjamin D. Crowe, bearing the more accurate title and based upon GA41, is now available with Rowman & Littlefield.

metaphysics, as *ens creatum* in the medieval period, and as *object* for a *subject* in early modern philosophy).[12] In both the lecture course and the essay, Heidegger singles out three historically extant ways in which the thing has been interpreted, as: (a) the bearer of traits, (b) the unity of a manifold of sensible intuition, and (c) matter in-formed (see, e.g., GA5:3–17/3–13). Each has both an ancient origin and a modern counterpart, and all have found a place, in Heidegger's view, in the contemporary interpretation of the thing. (This is an important acknowledgment of historical continuity worth stressing, especially in light of a prevalent temptation to think of Heidegger's thought in rigidly periodic terms.)

They are all measured and found wanting because they neglect the *significance* of the thing in the organization of a meaningful life, because they tell us precious little about nature as inspiring landscape (a topic neglected, as Heidegger himself observes, in *Being and Time*), the being of equipment, and the world-disclosing, or truth-revealing, power of the (great) work of ART. What *Being and Time* calls the "thing of nature" (SZ 63) becomes *earth*, a phenomenon that both makes the desire for intelligibility possible, by giving us something beyond ourselves to think, and secludes or conceals itself in our various efforts to master and control the nature into which we find ourselves thrown. And what Heidegger calls in 1927 the "thing of value" (SZ 63) becomes the world-revealing item of equipment in the experience of the farmer's shoe, mediated by the work of van Gogh (see GA5:3/3, 18–22/13–15, 27/20). In a remarkable passage in "The Origin," which anticipates later Heidegger's more humble vision of the gathering power of bridges and jugs, the ancient Greek temple is said to open up a world, set upon the earth, and to furnish *things* their look, and to human beings their outlook upon themselves.[13] In another noteworthy passage that anticipates later views on the gathering power of the thing, Heidegger observes that the temple gathers about itself the paths and relations in which human beings live and dwell, and so makes present, reveals, and opens the world of a historical PEOPLE (*Volk*), in tension or in conflict with the self-secluding earth, which Heidegger dissociates from the concept of earth regnant in modern astronomical science.[14]

The Later Years

Heidegger's final, and arguably his most important, phase in the philosophical career of the thing is marked by several noteworthy facts: (1) the collapse of the Nazi party, and Heidegger's attempt to come to terms with it; (2) the continuing importance of Hölderlin and poetry more generally in Heidegger's developing sense of the prospect of thinking after metaphysics;[15] (3) a conception of truth as disclosure, which Heidegger now argues to be important for the historical and philosophical interpretation of the history of the West and the possibility of a new, post-metaphysical INCEPTION (*Anfang*); (4) an increasing preoccupation with technology as a metaphysical force in human life, or as a fundamental determination of entities; and (5) a

[12] This three-pronged period-centered history of being appears in 1938, in "The Age of the World Picture" (GA5), and, with important qualifications, becomes a central feature of Heidegger's subsequent history of being.
[13] For accounts of the temple, see GA5:26–30/20–22.
[14] For Heidegger's account of earth, see esp. GA5:32–36/22–27, 50–52/37–39.
[15] Heidegger lectured on the poet in WS 1934–35 (GA39), WS 1941–42 (GA52), and SS 1942 (GA53).

religious sense of the plight, or the urgency and need (*Not*) of human existence in late modernity.[16]

This last phase is perhaps the best known, at least as far as Heidegger's views on the thing are concerned. It is also the period of Heidegger's most intense engagement with technology, which finds early expression in the 1938 essay "The Age of the World Picture" (GA5) and the notes, from the same period, on machination in the *Contributions to Philosophy* (GA65), and reaches a high point in the essay on "The Question Concerning Technology" (GA7/BW). This technological orientation is not unimportant: Heidegger's most considered views on the thing, as the gathering or meeting point of the fourfold, are tied to an interpretation of the technological interpretation of entities (or things) as *Bestand*. The original version of what became "The Thing," the first in a series of lectures delivered in Bremen in 1949 (GA79), is placed alongside a lecture on *Ge-Stell*, an early version of the better-known essay of 1955. There is a very close connection between reflection upon technology and reflection upon the thing in Heidegger's later work. (This can be seen already in "Wozu Dichter," 1946, GA5, if only briefly, in Heidegger's remarks on Rilke's views on the fate of things in an age of technological mastery, which are seminal for the positions worked out three years later.[17])

The setting of the question concerning the thing, in both the Bremen lectures and the essay of 1950, is the problem of what Heidegger calls "nearness," which seems to resemble the problem of leveling posed by Kierkegaard in the second half of *The Two Ages*: Despite our mania for proximity, Heidegger insists, we remain at a distance from things (that matter). Heidegger turns to consider a jug (the jug itself appears frequently in Heidegger's meditations on the thing, going back at least to the lecture course of 1935/36), as an emblem of what we fail to experience as a genuine thing, in the nearness of meaningful encounter.

What something like a jug, or a bridge (Heidegger's example in "Building Dwelling Thinking," GA7/PLT), shows, is the power to gather what he calls the fourfold (*Geviert*) – earth and sky, divinities and mortals. In a peculiar turn of phrase, rooted partly in etymological considerations, Heidegger suggests that when the thing is allowed to be, it can be shown to *thing*, to gather, to orient and bring aspects of the world together (GA77:12). The jug gathers earth in the way of its own "material," and in the water or wine it contains and gives, which has its earthly place, whether we realize it in thought and representation (*Vorstellung*) or not; sky, in that the wine is made possible (conditioned, *bedingt*) by the atmospheric conditions that gave it birth; mortals in the sense that we drink (wine or water) in light of our finite, death-bound sojourn on earth, for self-preservation, perhaps, or as part of a religious sense of the importance of the gift of drink; and the divinities (here Heidegger's account begins to raise some controversy) in that the water or the wine shows up in either sacred or secular commitments and experiences.

In several important respects, Heidegger's late account of the thing represents the culminating reflection upon a family of interconnected worries that shows up at the very beginning of Heidegger's path: (1) the tendency toward subjectivism (and objectivism, as subjectivism's other half), (2) a propensity to understate the being of things, and (3) the uprooted quality of human life and philosophy in the late modern era.

---

[16] For aphoristic presentations of the urgency in modern life, see *Contributions to Philosophy* (GA65); and for a rich interpretation of Heidegger's project, see Polt 2006.

[17] The first of three conversations in *Country Path Conversations* (GA77) notably presents the thing as a counterpoint to the object of modern life, and anticipates, more decisively, the "fourfold" of the later lectures and essays (see esp. GA77:125–41).

Regarding (3): Heidegger's work, early and late, can be read as a sustained meditation on what Simone Weil called *the need for roots*. (This comes out clearly in SS 1924, devoted to the soil or basis, *Boden*, of Aristotle's basic concepts; displays a disturbing political turn during the era of National Socialism; and continues to shape Heidegger's thought after the war on the conditions of philosophy, thought, poetry, and the meaning of human existence more generally.) In keeping with Heidegger's own approach to the topic of the thing, we could rename this pressing human need the requirement of *nearness*, where this means: proximity to authentic (not fabricated) sources of significance, and sources that promise to give more than the surfaces of things show. On this view, things can be said to anchor or place us within a world that promises to show more than it appears to reveal in an era of detachment, substitutability, technological ambitions, and the anomie that often accompanies life in an age of the world *as picture*. From this point of view, the discourse on the thing serves to elucidate the nature of DWELLING (*Wohnen*), as the essay on architectural things, like bridges and farmhouses in the Black Forest, makes clear.

Regarding (1): Heidegger's opposition to subjectivism is well known. And the late account of the thing is perfectly in keeping with reservations that can be traced back to the earliest lecture courses devoted to the nature of life and phenomenology as a science of life. Heidegger's reflections on the thing can be seen as the culmination of a long-standing polemic against the subjective orientation of modern thought, which leads to what we might call a *projective* theory of meaning (which, for Heidegger, is synonymous with the philosophy of VALUE), according to which the significance and value we discover in things is a more or less secret bestowal of worth onto a neutral (worthless) field of mere fact. It is controversial, but important, that Heidegger does not associate the experience of the thing with activities of the imagination, thought-exercises, and the like: the meaning Heidegger hopes to recover from the experience of the thing lies in the very thing itself and its power to orient the individual and to gather, not just individuals but the larger reaches or domains of the cosmos.

Regarding (2): This is possibly the core of later Heidegger's vision of the thing, or at least its most novel contribution to the question concerning the thing, as it begins to show in 1935. And it is most closely allied with Heidegger's discovery of *poetry* as an original disclosure of the truth about entities, and perhaps about even being itself. In a way, Heidegger has been arguing against our inveterate tendency to understate the being of things since 1919. (Recall the distinction between the sun for astronomy and the sun as it shines for the chorus of Theban elders in KNS 1919, or the flower-strewn meadow in May on a hike and the same "object" for botanical science in WS 1919–20, or the tale of two tables Heidegger tells in 1923.) To be sure, *Sein und Zeit* could be said to pivot around an attempt to rescue the being of equipment from the tyranny of the merely extant; but Heidegger has moved far away from what we might call functionalism in the interpretation of entities, and his work on things can be read as a silent critique of the earlier paradigm of the work-world, in favor of an interpretation of work and its world rooted in something beyond the laboring subject.

2 RECEPTION AND INFLUENCE: A SELECTIVE SKETCH

In light of the role played by ontological REFLECTION (*Besinnung*, as later Heidegger would have it) upon the thing in the long development of Heidegger's ontology – a role that persists despite certain palpable shifts in emphasis, mode of questioning, and manner of expression – it is

remarkable that there is in the Anglophone world no book-length study of the thing in Heidegger, early, middle, or late.[18] Still, many scholars have offered interpretations of the thing in Heidegger's later thought, often driven by perplexity over the fourfold, especially the meaning of the divinities, and theorists and practitioners of architecture have helped to reveal Heidegger's importance in thinking about what it might mean to dwell among things in privileged places in the late modern age. And one important North American theorist of technology has drawn considerable inspiration from the late poetic ontology of the thing in an influential work on the nature of modern technology and the need for and the possibilities of reform within the technological way in which we take up with the world (Borgmann, 1984).

The recent work of Jeff Malpas on place and topology should help to renew thinking about the thing in Heidegger's work, especially in connection with the tasks of building and dwelling, although his work touches upon the thing, surprisingly, only in passing. Malpas's writings also help to place Heidegger's efforts to overcome the "metaphysics of subjectivity" – of which essays like "The Thing" and "Building Dwelling Thinking" form an essential part – in opposition to the agenda(s) of National Socialism, which Malpas associates, fruitfully, with a certain interpretation of Nietzsche's doctrine of the will to power as the ultimate expression of the subjective orientation of modern thought and its poverty.[19]

Similar efforts can be detected in Julian Young's engagement with late Heidegger and the poetics of dwelling, where reflection upon technology and the thing plays a central role; in Mugerauer's massive study of *Heidegger and Homecoming*, which centers on the problem of UNCANNINESS and the task of finding a homeland (*Heimat*) in Heidegger's late work and includes several lengthy discussions of Heidegger's conception of the gathering, homecoming force of things; and in Graham Harman's provocative employment of Heidegger's thing-ontology to drive and support the development of what he takes to be a new species of realism. Each of these works both draws from and embodies Heidegger's efforts to overcome the subjective orientation of modern thought.

Heidegger's late work on things and the places they disclose or help to structure has had an appreciable impact on both the theory and the practice of architecture. The Heideggerian work of Karsten Harries on what he calls "the ethical function of architecture" has inspired both the philosophy of architecture and the practice of architects in search of a mode of building commensurate with the ethical demands and urgencies of human life in the late modern world.[20]

Albert Borgmann's *Technology and the Character of Contemporary Life* represents perhaps the most thorough and compelling appropriation in the English-speaking world of Heidegger's late conception of the gathering power of the thing. This rich work pivots around the distinction between what Borgmann calls "the device paradigm" and "focal things and practices." The former is exemplified in the concealed technological gadgets designed to disappear in the production of commodities, the carefree products of use and enjoyment; the latter are tied to meaningful contexts, open up a meaningful world, assemble human beings around shared concerns, and make possible orienting and sustaining practices that furnish life with purpose, significance, and value.

---

[18] Mitchell 2015 is the only exception, but his book came out too late to be discussed here.
[19] See, esp., "Geography, Biology, and Politics" in Malpas 2012.
[20] For a short list of thinkers and practitioners influenced by Heidegger, see Adam Sharr's short but useful discussion (Sharr 2006, 7).

Borgmann's book has probably done more to arouse interest in and productive controversy over Heidegger's thing-centered critique of technology than any other work in English, especially in light of persistent worries that Heidegger's poetic account of the *Geviert* encourages the nostalgia of a reactionary anti-modernism. Borgmann worries that Heidegger's example of the jug, for instance, "seems as remote to most of us and as muted in its focusing power as the Parthenon or the Cathedral of Chartres" (Borgmann 1984, 199). Borgmann's suggestion that we ought to look for possible reform within technology, against what he takes to be Heidegger's misguided search for "pretechnological enclaves" of meaning, combined with his suspicion that "the technological era, unlike Classical Greece or the Middle Ages, [has] not brought forth focal things or events, temples or cathedrals, processions or celebrations in which the significance and coherence of life [has] come to be focused" (Borgmann 1984, 159), helped to inspire Dreyfus and Spinosa to locate thing-like (gathering) potential within the technological world, in a well-known and influential article on the highway bridge. (For a powerful critique of Dreyfus and Spinosa, see Zimmerman 2000.)

It would, of course, be risky to try to predict whether, and if so how, Heidegger's work on the thing will shape philosophical discourse to come. But in light of current anxieties, facing the enormity of the technological transformation of the globe, and in keeping with the need, for now still felt, to think about what might center and orient life in an age judged by many to be postmodern, and in view of Heidegger's own increasingly disturbing involvement in the politics of National Socialism (fueled most recently by the publication of the Black Notebooks), it seems fair to say that his philosophical and poetic meditations on the thing ought to play a role in the ongoing discussions of the nature and problems of the age and Heidegger's capacity to remain relevant to philosophy today.

James D. Reid

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 54–56, 67–69, 79–83; GA5:28–33/21–25, 80–82/60–62, 291–93/218–20, 329–31/248–50; GA41:1–52, 61–65, 70–76, 90–95; GA56/57:182–84; GA58:9, 16, 46, 51–52, 104, 127, 157, 163, 182, 190; GA59:36; GA65; GA77:85–87, 125–29, 132–34, 137–41; GA79:5–7, 13–17, 20–24, 45–54

FURTHER READING

Borgmann 1984, Dreyfus and Spinosa 1997, Harries 1997, Malpas 2012, Mitchell 2015, Mugerauer 2008, Reid 2005, Young 2001, Zimmerman 2000

202.
THINKING (*DENKEN*)

I N H I S   E A R L I E S T   work, Heidegger endeavored to develop a conception of thought oriented around judgment and logic that was neither psychologistic nor exhaustively captured through the formalisms of mathematical logic (GA1:22, 33/BH 33, 39). Thus Heidegger's early conception of thought was very much the one that he would later refer to as rational thinking (*das vernünftige Denken*) and thinking as judgment (*dem urteilenden Denken*, GA6.2:65/N4 40). Heidegger does not assign any discernible technical meaning to thought in his early works, above and beyond the effort to avoid both a Platonism that would "hypostasize" meanings and a psychologism about meanings that would reduce meanings to psychological episodes. An analysis of M E A N I N G rather than an analysis of the psychological or causal mechanisms involved in thought was to be key to progress in understanding thought (GA1:186). He viewed thought in terms of the propositions expressed by judgments; he combined this picture with an Aristotelian-scholastic emphasis on categories of real objects to which judgments would correspond. In his work on the philosophy of L O G I C, language, and categories of pseudo-Duns Scotus (Thomas of Erfurt), Heidegger attempted to bring together an Aristotelian-scholastic realist conception of categories and meaning with the work of Franz Brentano, Edmund Husserl, and Emil Lask. He took over Lask's conception that judgment is ultimately grounded in the process of life and connected the process of life with the (broadly Hegelian) notion of "S P I R I T" from neo-Kantianism and Dilthey that Heidegger rightly took to be essentially historical, but also metaphysical (GA1:406ff.).

Heidegger overthrew his allegiance to the scholastic reading of Aristotle and of thought in the late 1910s. He replaced the propositional picture of thought as a relation of subjects to objects with a more subtle reading of Aristotle as a philosopher concerned foremost with the phenomena of everyday life and of how thought emerges from everyday life. He came to think of thought as situated in the process of life. It is in the nature of human existence and also of thought itself that it is "practical life-performance": "the human being is a historical being who stands in practical life-performance," he is not "an occurring [*Vorkommen*], but performance [*Vollzug*]" (GA58:156; cf. SZ 48). Such performance is taken up by the process of F O R M A L   I N D I C A T I O N that is key to thought properly so-called and to avoiding the illusory confusion of thought and of logic with a certain object- and subject-matter-dependent conception that misses logic's "radical problematic" (GA58:18ff., 20–21). The view is more explicitly developed at the end of the 1920s (1929–30): "Philosophical concepts are … all formally indicative. They are indicative says: the meaning-content of these concepts does not mean and directly say that to which it refers, it only gives an indication [*Anzeige*], a suggestion that the one who understands is asked to perform a transformation of himself into Dasein" (GA29/30:428–29). This transformation into Dasein of philosophical concepts is particularly important and possible with respect to limit-concepts: "these [philosophical] concepts D E A T H, R E S O L U T E N E S S, E X I S T E N C E, historicity … speak to this transformation [*Verwandlung*]; they are *formally indicating* because according to their essence they show [point into – *hineinzeigen*] the concreteness of an individual

Dasein in the ʜᴜᴍᴀɴ ʙᴇɪɴɢ, but they never already include this concreteness in their content" (GA29/30:428–29). References to thought in *Being and Time* are prominently in terms of thinking death (SZ 254, 257–58, 261, 309) or to thinking things through to the end in a way that only thinking death thinks authentically (SZ 305, 424); the limit-experience of death is key to the proper understanding of thought itself. Thought in its most authentic sense is not concerned with specific objects, but with what is nothing from the standpoint of specific objects. Being, truth, the world, and significance are from the point of view of objects, nothing. This is why they are manifest to us in situations involving the breakdown of significance such as death.

Heidegger's detached relationship to the received conception of "thinking" (*Denken*) in *Being and Time* is reflected in his use of scare quotes: "in 'mere' knowledge about a context of the being of entities, in 'only' representing it, in 'solely' 'thinking' [*Denken*] about it, I am no less outside in the world together with things than I am when I *originally* grasp them" (SZ 62). Purely spectatorial thinking is taken to be an abstraction from our involvements in the world and sunk into a conception of understanding that involves our shared and individual temporal agency: "'intuition' and 'thought' are already remote derivatives of understanding" (SZ 147). Heidegger entertains and rejects the idea of thinking as merely subjectively representing. His point is that even such representing already presupposes the very conception of our being-in-the-world as agents who are interacting in a natural and social context from which the representational model takes itself to be abstracting. Many of the references in *Being and Time* to thinking are to the Kantian "I think" (*ich denke*, SZ 24, 319–20), and to the neo-Kantian notion of a pattern of relations of "pure thought" (*das reine Denken*, SZ 88) and the criticism of such thought as the atemporal thought of an "isolated" "worldless subject" (SZ 321, 110). Heidegger distances himself from Kant's "I think" (the Cartesian cogito and traditional propositional thought) as thinking by a thinker with only a contingent relation to the world. Heidegger arguably misunderstands the Kantian "I think" as that of a "worldless subject" (SZ 110) because he thinks that "Kant did not see the phenomenon of world" (SZ 321) so that Kant did not see that the world is presupposed in the I think (SZ 319–20). Heidegger became more attentive after *Being and Time* to the rich notion of an agent's temporal and spatial transcendence built into the Kantian conception of thought as grounded in actions of our thought. By 1928, Heidegger began to recognize the "existentiell" significance of world in Kant's *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View* and the rich temporal commitments involved for Kant in the articulation of I thoughts in the inner and outer dialogue of language. Heidegger emphasizes that in Kant's *Anthropology*: "'world' means precisely human existence in historical being with one another, and not the appearance of the human being" ("The Essence of Ground," 1928, in GA9:153/119–20; see also GA27:297ff.). Heidegger came to see that Kant is concerned in his most fundamental world or cosmopolitan conception of philosophy with what from Heidegger's own point of view are "determinations of human Dasein.... Kant knows the sentence 'the human being is a being that exists as its own end' as the most fundamental a priori determination of the essence of human Dasein" (GA24:10–12). Heidegger came to argue in *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* that transcendence of the self to the world and embeddedness in ᴛɪᴍᴇ and sᴘᴀᴄᴇ were at the heart of Kant's conception of thought which was always finite. Thought becomes the temporal process of "pure ɪᴍᴀɢɪɴᴀ-ᴛɪᴏɴ" sunk into the projective context of the agent's ends (GA3:151). Heidegger thought that Kant had not been able to bring his (theoretical judgment and proposition based) scholastic and cosmopolitan (world as context of ends based) conceptions of philosophy together (GA24:10).

Heidegger emphasizes that thought is grounded in metaphysical principles that govern the normative binding of thought in human life and agency: "only freedom can be the origin of binding. A basic problem of logic, the lawfulness of thought [*Denken*] reveals itself in its ground as a problem of human existence, as a problem of freedom" (GA26:25). Following Kant's conception of thought in logic as expressing the normativity of the action of thought, Heidegger argues that logic depends on the normative freedom of action: "the essence of Dasein and of thought (*Denken*) first makes possible the conditions for the carrying out of thought and the way those conditions are necessarily used" (GA26:129). Heidegger criticizes Kant for his assimilation of the problem of free agency that also underlies thought to the theoretical problem of causation. The theoretical model of causation prevents Kant (according to Heidegger) not only from properly bringing his scholastic and cosmopolitan conceptions together, but also from seeing how the question of being and the nature of thought is rooted in the question of human freedom (GA26:129, but esp. GA31:300ff.). Heidegger ultimately sees Kant's challenge to the model of timeless logical propositional thought solely in the (for Heidegger abortive) effort to ground concepts and judgments in the imagination, rather than in the richer temporality of reason in language, action, and public discourse and in the social character of science and pure reason itself emphasized in the *Anthropology* and B-Preface to the *Critique*. Heidegger sees Kant wavering before the consequences of his thought and finally succumbing to the lure of pure reason (GA3:161–62).

In the later 1930s, Heidegger rejects metaphysical thought itself rather than calling only for the emancipation of metaphysical thought from logic. Heidegger still shares his earlier conception of a reform of thought as "transformation of man into Dasein." He now argues that will prepare the way for thinkers of the future: "only he who is capable of again and again traversing such quite long paths is fit to be a coming thinker. He who has never reached that far and has never withstood shocks in all the essential time-spaces at the threshold of the transformation of man into Da-sein does not know what *thought* (*Denken*) is" (GA66:41). Instead of grounding thought and ontology in human freedom and its temporality, however, Heidegger now grounds human agency and thought in the normative way in which being and truth temporally disclose themselves to us. Heidegger now ties metaphysical thought to concern with the being of entities rather than being itself. This is why he now argues that what is "proper to thought is not obtained through logic or in view of assertions made about entities" (GA6:211). Assertions about entities are a matter of "'metaphysics' – and that always says here: the in its truth groundless dominance of being determined by thought as representation [*Denken* als Vorstellen]" (GA66:25). Heidegger complains that even the attempt at a "self-overcoming" of "metaphysical thought" "from its own presuppositions" must fail "as such an effort (*Being and Time*) is unavoidably read *in turn* metaphysically" (GA66:211). Heidegger becomes increasingly inclined to oppose thought in the positive sense, especially poetic thought and thought of being and the truth of being, not only to "calculative thought" but even to reason: "thinking begins only when we have the experience that the reason praised for centuries is the most persistent opponent of thinking" (GA5:267/199). He tends to think of reason in terms of grasping the grounds for taking certain things to be true of entities; as such, reason misses out on what matters most in thinking as he understands it: "reason … only pursues a thinking that is turned toward entities and is always a superficial thinking" (GA66:49).

Heidegger takes up what he regards as Hölderlin's post-metaphysical poetic thought in the late 1930s. He pushes what he comes to call "the STEP BACK from mere representational, that is,

explanatory thought [*vorstellenden, d.h. erklärenden Denken*], to thought as REMEMBRANCE" ("The Thing," GA7:183/PLT 179). Heidegger interprets Hölderlin's poetry as a form of thought (*Denken*); the interest that he takes in the poem "Remembrance" ("Andenken," GA52:16) is based on the idea that the poem is fundamentally about the nature of poetic thought itself. "'Andenken' does not 'lyrically' shape 'personal memories' of the human being Hölderlin, instead it grounds the essence of remembrance [*Andenken*] as such in its essential connection with the essence of poetry of the completely other poet" (GA52:24). On the surface, "Andenken" is "remembrance of the past" (GA52:24) and of events from the poet's trip to Bordeaux. But as Heidegger sees it, the particular form of recollection achieved by the poem actually requires "another [kind of] thinking" (*ein anderes Denken*, GA52:50). This other kind of thinking is associated with the "other INCEPTION" of thought that would return thought to its origins in pre-Socratic philosophy and begin to think in a new way that is not tied to the distinctions between different kinds of things with which Heidegger identifies metaphysical thought.

Thus remembrance becomes a term for Heidegger to describe the retrieval for the present and the future of the beginning of philosophy in its union with POETRY and MYTH (saying, *die Sage*). Instead of thinking of language as a set of propositions that have been asserted about things, language as a whole is conceived of as the effort to express the comprehensive significance of things, their being. "'Remembrance' [*Andenken*] establishes the limits in the essence of 'Remembrance' as a basic relation to what persists and to entities" (GA75:12). Hölderlin is the thinker who comes closest in his poetry and thought to achieving Heidegger's prospective return to the "original inception" and the union of myth and *logos*, of poetry and thought, by thinking and poetically expressing the unfolding of truth in NATURE and HISTORY (the event of truth). Characteristic of such remembrance thought (*Andenken*) and its "other thinking" is a conception of human existence and the world as "poetic DWELLING" in the truth constituting the opposition between mortals and gods, the EARTH and the sky (see FOURFOLD). Thus in his book on Hölderlin, Heidegger identifies poetry (*Dichten*) and remembrance (*Andenken*): "poetry [*Dichten*] is remembrance [*Andenken*]. Remembrance is installation [*Stiftung*]. The installing dwelling of the poet shows and hallows the ground for the poetic dwelling of the sons of the earth. Something persistent [*ein Bleibendes*] comes to persist" (GA4:151/172). What Heidegger thinks of as coming to persist through the remembrance of poetry is the very comprehensive context of significance as it is manifest to us in our historical EPOCH. Such remembrance is a "remembrance of what has been bestowed, perhaps only also as a sign in proximity to the flight of the gods who take care with us" (GA4:196/225). In "The Origin of the Work of Art" (1936), the opposition between things and the world that haunted the late twenties and its notion of the "world entry" of things is reinterpreted as "the opposition of world and earth" (GA5:35/PLT 47), where the earth is that aspect of the truth (as unhiddenness) that keeps itself hidden and the world is understood in expressed relation to the will as "the self-disclosing openness of … the essential decisions in the DESTINY of an historical PEOPLE" (GA5:35/PLT 47). Heidegger is already well past the conception of things entering into the world to which they have no essential relation. Things do not "enter the world," especially as artworks; things constitute or set the world up in the first place: "the presence of something present such as the jug comes into its own, appropriately manifests and determines itself, only from the thinging of the thing.... The thing things world" (GA7:179, 182/PLT 175, 178). The hiddenness of being is manifest in the event that opens up the earth, the unhiddenness in the sky and the tension between immanence and transcendence of world in us as mortals and the gods.

Heidegger becomes increasingly critical of what he calls calculative thinking (*rechnende Denken*) and wishes increasingly to find the ultimate source of normativity of thought in the event that makes being and things significant for us. His very first works reveal an interest in mathematics and mathematical logic but also a wariness about whether mathematical logic could provide its own foundations. He gradually becomes more and more skeptical about whether even propositions are at the right level of abstraction to understand language and to make sense of our thought. Heidegger's increasing interest in poetic thought, especially that of Hölderlin in the mid-1930s to early 1940s, makes him question the assumption that it is informative or (if it is taken as an informative claim) even plausible to think that all thought follows logical rules. In the course of the 1940s, Heidegger comes to juxtapose thinking (*Denken*) and what he now calls the calculative thought (*rechnende Denken*, GA12:251/OWL 132) that obeys logical and mathematical rules. Calculative thought is associated with but by no means simply identical to representational thought. Representational thought is connected to but not wholly identical to scientific representation. Scientific representation is dominated by method. In contrast to scientific representation, thinking in Heidegger's positive sense is guided by context or the region in which the paths of thought unfold (GA12:179/OWL 84–85).

He becomes increasingly hostile to the dominance of the technical model of competence and juxtaposes technical thought to meaningful or meditative thinking (*besinnliches Denken*); it is, however, part of his conception of meaningful thought and of the equanimity or "RELEASE-MENT" (*Gelassenheit*) with which Heidegger associates it that one can live in the technological world without being absorbed by its form of thought (GA13:70/DT 54): "the nature of thinking (that in-dwell-ing equanimous-releasement [*inständige Gelassenheit*] to that-which-regions [*geg-net*]) which is the essentially human relation to that-which-regions, we presage as the nearness of distance." "Calculative thinking is not meditative thinking, not thinking which contemplates the meaning which reigns in everything that is. There are then, two kinds of thinking, each justified and needed in its own way: calculative thinking and meditative thinking" (GA16:519/DT 46). Heidegger sums up his worry about calculative thinking as the concern that such thought replaces true thought with that which is subject to technical manipulation: "all putting in place sees itself inducted into calculative thinking (*rechnende Denken*) and thus speaks the language of the INVENTORY [posited configuration, *Ge-Stell*]" (GA12:251/OWL 131). Heidegger worries that "calculative thinking may someday come to be accepted and practiced as the only way of thinking. What great danger then might move upon us? Then there might go hand in hand with the greatest ingenuity in calculative planning and inventing indifference toward meditative thinking [*besinnliches Denken*], total thoughtlessness. And then? Then man would have denied and thrown away his own special nature" (GA16:527–28/DT 56).

What gives us concern as thinkers are initially questions of earth-threatening proportions. Heidegger alludes to these things in talking of ours as "the most concerning [*bedenklichste*] time" (GA7:130); but he regards these concerns as themselves tied to the rise of TECHNOLOGY and to our inability to think outside the box or inventory (*Ge-Stell*) of technology. Our overall planetary situation is what is prima facie of most overwhelming concern. But the forces at work in our current world situation are themselves for him mere manifestations of our relationship to being. And thus what we have not thought or thought through is the matter of most concern to us. What we have not thought through is first of all the very power of technology over us. The discussion of *Bedenken* is most prominent in the lecture and the lecture series published as a book *What is Called Thinking?* "We call now therefore and in the sequel that

which is to be thought always, because from long ago and before and after everything: the greatest concern for thought [*das Bedenklichste*]. What is the greatest concern for thought? … [T]hat we do not yet think" (GA8:130).

Heidegger's answer to our failure yet to think is his own conception of thinking the event of truth: *Erdenken*. *Erdenken* is the thinking through of the way in which the event of significance itself manifests itself in past, present, and future thought. Such thinking of being is meaningful REFLECTION on the present (*Besinnung des Gegenwärtigen*), but not in the sense of observation that stands apart and reflects on "cultural streams," but as "*action*" (*Handeln*). One "acts in thinking" (*denkerisch gehandelt*) about the present situation in the HISTORY OF BEING to bring about a "decision about BEYNG" (*eine Entscheidung über das Seyn*, GA66:70; cf. also GA66:46, for philosophy as *er-denken* of beyng). Heidegger connects the prefix *er-* to his interpretation of thought to convey the grounding of thought in the event of significance through which being is established in its presence (including also the presence of the past and of the future). Heidegger calls this event in which things come into their own: *Er-eignis*, ADAPTATION. *Erdenken* is the thinking of things in their coming into their own and their proper measure in the event that is the presence (*Anwesenheit*) of being. Being and truth come into their own and thus make the measure of things and thus normativity manifest in the event. "Thought [*Das Denken*] to come is *das Er-denken* (the ad-apted saying [*er-eignete Sagen*]) … in preparation for … the OVERCOMING of metaphysics" (GA66:15). Thought in this sense is thinking in terms of the event in which things become both unhidden and hidden in the manner appropriate to them. "Thus, if the word *Er-denken* is understood according to the ordinary linguistic usage, it is thoroughly misleading and should, therefore, be avoided. In the meaning that is claimed here, it means the thinking [*Denken*] that is previously ad-apted [*er-eignet*] by beyng [*Seyn*] in contrast to metaphysical [thinking] as thinking that re-presents entities [*das Seiende*] by bringing them before it" (GA66:357). Such thinking is "thinking of the inception" which thinks "the original inception" of philosophy in order to prepare the way for "another inception" of thought than the beginning of metaphysics in Plato and his conception of ideas as the being of entities (GA65:57ff., 156ff.). Historical thought about beyng (*das seynsgeschichtliche Denken*) is part of the renewed return to the beginning of thought; as Heidegger's use of *Seyn* indicates, it is not so much an effort to come to terms with the history of metaphysics, as he understands metaphysics, on its own terms, as it is an effort to come to terms with the history of thought in terms of Heidegger's own project of grasping the ongoing event through which being and truth have both revealed and hidden themselves. Such historical thought of being is especially "the *er-denken*" – thinking into its own – of and by Da-sein and thus the thinking of being as the event of coming into its own (GA66:211).

Heidegger also talks of "essential thought" (*das wesentliche Denken*, GA66:77). Such essential thought is precisely not the thinking of essence in the terms familiar to contemporary and traditional metaphysics (this counts for him as inessential because concerned with essence in the sense of *essentia*; cf. GA5:37/28). Great philosophers are essential thinkers (*wesentliche Denker*) in part because they are never limited by the frameworks in which they work: "every essential thinker is irrefutable (the essential thinker is the one who has won through to an original and therefore basic position that is one of a kind)" (GA66:75). Essential thinkers allow the possibility of a truly essential thought by their role in the history of being. They allow one to see "the essential and insurmountable obstacles" in the way of the "history of thought in its future" (GA66:77). The endeavor to come to terms with the "uniqueness of the questioning thought of

thinkers in the beginning" makes it possible for one to be precursor to "future thinkers" and so to measure up to the demands placed on one by "the essence of thinking thought" (*des Wesens denkerischen Denkens*, GA66:77).

The development of his thought from its earliest inception pointed Heidegger to the need to understand judgment and propositions, but also the significance of mathematical formalisms in logic, in terms of the context of our understanding as agents involved in the process of history that gives them significance. We cannot take significance to be independent of the whole context in which we are engaged as agents, including everyday life. In his later philosophy, Heidegger comes to be concerned that metaphysical thought and thought guided by technology suppress the overall context of significance in favor of those aspects of our understanding and engagement with the world that focus on systematically manipulating things. In his terminology, the question of being in general and the significance that is temporally established by the event that gives everything its proper place and standard in the order of things is suppressed or not even seen. Instead one looks to those specific contexts of inquiry that seem to allow for a more precise treatment and manipulation. Heidegger attempts to restore order here by having us think radically about the event in terms of which being itself becomes significant for us.

Pierre Keller

FURTHER READING

Crowell and Malpas 2007, Gadamer 1972, Keller 2000, Powell 2013

203.
THROWNNESS (*GEWORFENHEIT*)

"Thrownness" is first used in *Being and Time* to name Dasein's passive coming into being open, and so Dasein's birth, origin, or ground. Heidegger continues to describe Dasein as thrown in his later thought, closely associating thrownness with ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*) and identifying the "thrower" of the throw into EXISTENCE as BEING. Especially in *Being and Time*, the pure throw into Dasein continues as a throw into concretion (FACTICITY), FALLING, and inauthenticity, although it is not entirely clear how these phenomena are both connected to and distinguished from one another.

That Dasein is *thrown* means primarily that its "birth" (SZ 374) is something past and something that Dasein passively undergoes. First, coming into Dasein is not the result of Dasein's agency. It did not choose *either* to be *or* to be what it is. Second, coming into Dasein is something that has already happened. To *have been thrown into existence* is for the throw to have already occurred (even if, strictly, it has not yet finished).

Because the throw has already been executed, *that it is* is now something that Dasein is stuck with or has to put up with. This yields an expanded sense of "thrownness" as the *that it is* of Dasein. Heidegger often expresses this as Dasein's being thrown *into* itself or its existential CONSTITUTION. Dasein is thrown into: existence (SZ 276), the THERE (*da*) (SZ 135, 148, 284, 297, 413), the "NOTHING" (SZ 277), INDIVIDUALIZATION (SZ 339), (the possibility of) DEATH (SZ 251, 256, 308, 329), being-toward-death (SZ 348), the indefiniteness of its "limit-situation" (SZ 308), being-GUILTY (SZ 291), UNCANNINESS (SZ 343), the self's world (SZ 383), and the WORLD (SZ 228, 348, 413). As so thrown, Dasein is delivered over (*überantworten*) to: its being (SZ 42, 135), itself (SZ 144, 192, 284, 383), itself in its being (SZ 189), existence (SZ 276), the there (*da*, SZ 135), its ABILITY-TO-BE (SZ 383), (its) death (SZ 251, 252, 254, 259), its thrownness (SZ 396) into the there (SZ 148), the fact that it must always have found itself (SZ 135), and the possibility of first finding itself again (SZ 144). Dasein is thus abandoned (*überlassen*) to itself (SZ 192, 308, 365), to its own null basis (SZ 348), and to having been (SZ 365). Being thrown into the determination of its ESSENCE is thrownness as the *that it is* of Dasein.

In particular, Dasein is thrown (*geworfen*) into projecting (*entwerfen, Entwurf*) (SZ 145). Projecting is itself a kind of throwing (*werfen*), making Dasein the conjunction of two sorts of throws: thrown projection (*geworfene Entwurf*). (Following Husserl's description of the psychic as "the counterthrust [*Gegenwurf*] of nature" (GA20:165), Heidegger will occasionally think Dasein's projection or transcendence as a counter-throw (*Gegenwurf*, e.g., GA9:342/260), or even as a "throwing free" (*Loswurf*, casting loose, GA65; Husserl 1910/11, 314)).

To count as thrown – to count as stuck with a *that it is* that one has already passively come into – one must find oneself thus. Entities that are not self-finding cannot count as thrown, even if they come to their *that it is* passively and without choice. Conversely, to find oneself is always to find oneself as thrown, since one finds oneself as one already is. Thus thrownness is officially introduced and defined in the *Being and Time* section on "findingness" or DISPOSEDNESS

(*Befindlichkeit*, §29). It is in Dasein's various modes of disposedness, including MOOD, that it is revealed to itself as thrown. So revealed, Dasein encounters its *that it is* not as a contingent fact but with the force of necessity. Now *that it is* has come into existence, Dasein "must [*muß*] be" in the sense that it must be presupposed (SZ 228). Its *that it is* is a necessary burden, revealed in every mode of self-finding.

The necessary *that it is* is also revealed as having the "inexorability of an enigma" (SZ 136); it is "incomprehensible" (SZ 228). To make this point, Heidegger deploys the grammar of "throwing." The throw of thrownness has a whence: a point from which it originates. This is the ground or explanation for Dasein's coming into Dasein. Heidegger describes this whence as hidden or in darkness (SZ 135, 276, 348), which means that Dasein never "comes back behind its thrownness" (SZ 284, 383) not only in that it cannot ground itself but also in that it cannot grasp its ground.

The hiddenness of Dasein's ground is not surrendered when Heidegger later identifies the thrower of thrownness as being. To say that being throws Dasein open, or throws it into its openness, is not to explain how Dasein comes to be so much as to restate the necessity of the inexorable fact that it is. For being throws Dasein open because it *needs* Dasein, which is to say that "TRUTH and *Dasein* must be" (SZ 228). We still do not know *why*; the whence remains obscure.

There is a further component to *Being and Time*'s official definition of thrownness. Thrownness is Dasein's "'that it is and has to be'" (*Dass es ist und zu sein hat*, SZ 135). The *has to be* indicates not necessity but the imperative of a task. Because Dasein is stuck with its being, Dasein is stuck with the task of *being* itself – of going forward as the entity that it is. This project of going forward is plausibly the "whither" or "to which" of the throw of thrownness. Like the whence, this whither is obscure: Dasein's essence does not determine *how* (SZ 348) Dasein in any given case is to go forward and be what it is.

The obscure whence and whither of thrownness are revealed in moods. Moods can either turn toward thrownness authentically (e.g., ANXIETY, *Angst*) or inauthentically cover it up (e.g., fear). The latter sort of mood amounts to a flight from thrownness – specifically, from thrownness into death (SZ 348). There is dispute about what sort of finitude "death" names, but in his discussion of guilt Heidegger identifies the nullity that motivates Dasein to flee as the passivity of thrownness (SZ 284). As his discussion makes clear, however, such passivity matters only because, as the sort of entity that it is, Dasein must nonetheless face up to its obscure *has to be* and take over the task of being itself. Inauthentic Dasein flees this underdetermined task and so flees the veiled whither of the throw (and presumably also the veiled whence of the throw, i.e., the inexplicability of its ground).

Inauthentic Dasein covers over the burden of having to determine how to go about being Dasein by letting the ANYONE (*das Man*) decide for it: it takes over possibilities that are immediately available. Authentic Dasein, in contrast, retrieves a possible way of being Dasein from its heritage (see AUTHENTICITY). Dasein hands down to itself the possibilities that it has inherited with its world, "but not necessarily *as* having thus come down" to it (SZ 383). This allegedly amounts to "coming back resolutely to one's thrownness" (SZ 383), "*being* Dasein authentically *as it already was*" (SZ 325), and "repeating" one's thrownness (SZ 343). The possibility of doing this is revealed in the mood of anxiety, in which Dasein faces up to its *that it is and has to be*. And just as facing up to the obscure whence of the *that it is* and the obscure whither in the *has to be* does not make these any less obscure, so too resolutely taking over its thrown ground does not make Dasein any more an author of itself. But authentic Dasein in

some sense appropriates its own lack of agency by resolving on a particular way of going forward as the entity that it is.

Why does inauthentic Dasein not do this? Why does it cover over the burden of its *has to be*? It is not clear. To compound the difficulty, Heidegger has an alternative story in *Being and Time* on which thrownness itself, rather than any motivated flight, leads us to falling and inauthenticity. This story significantly extends the scope of "thrownness" and can lead us to confuse it with other phenomena.

Heidegger thinks the throw into being Dasein as a motion that has already been initiated but is not yet finished. Dasein "remains in the throw" of thrownness, and it does so by virtue of its facticity (SZ 179, cf. 284):

> Proximally, the throw [*Wurf*] of Dasein's being-thrown into the world is one that does not authentically get caught. The "movement" which such a throw implies does not come to "a stop" because Dasein now "is there." Dasein gets dragged along in thrownness; that is to say, as something which has been thrown into the world, it loses itself in the "world" in its factical submission to that with which it is to concern itself. (SZ 348, added scare quotes removed)

Facticity is the distinctive way in which Dasein is concretely present and determined as an entity. While some other entities are simply there as present facts, Dasein's concretion has a "complicated structure" (SZ 56). Dasein is *there* concretely only by (i) grasping itself as a concrete entity (SZ 135), (ii) in terms of some determinate ability-to-be (*Seinkönnen*) – i.e., by "dispersing" (SZ 56) itself amongst possibilities of comportment. In being for the sake of its ability-to-be, Dasein (iii) engages with particular entities in terms of their AFFORDANCES and so in terms of the world. Thus as factical, Dasein is "delivered over to" definite possibilities, definite entities, and so a definite world. Because factical concretion delivers Dasein over in this way, Heidegger sometimes thinks it as a dimension of thrownness, which delivers Dasein over to itself. The throw of thrownness is in a sense furthered by facticity. (Hence the odd locutions "factical thrownness," SZ 386, 413, and "factically thrown," SZ 298, 394, 410, 435.) If thrownness includes facticity, then it becomes intelligible to say that Dasein is thrown "under and upon" (*worunter und woran*, GA26:13) or "on" (*an*) (GA26:20) entities as a whole, and into a (not the) world (SZ 192) and so into the publicness of the anyone (SZ 167). Dasein is now situated and contextualized; the pure (SZ 343) or naked (SZ 134) *that it is Dasein* becomes the *that it is x, y, z as a case of Dasein*. Further, insofar as Dasein's concretion is bodily and biological, Heidegger can say that Dasein is thrown into (qua factically subject to) natural entities (SZ 412, GA26: 174) and can associate thrownness with the body (GA26: 212). (Many interpreters invoke only this extended or derivative sense of "thrownness" (i.e., facticity).)

Further, facticity delivers Dasein all the way over to inauthenticity: "Dasein's facticity is such that, *as long as* it is what it is, Dasein remains in the throw, and is sucked into the turbulence of the 'anyone's' inauthenticity" (SZ 179). Turbulence is a characteristic of falling, which is here ambiguous between being-amidst-entities (i.e., facticity) and inauthentic dispersal in the anyone. In any case, it is thought as an "ontological motion" (SZ 180). The motion of the throw of thrownness apparently continues through that of factical delivering over and culminates in the motion of falling. Falling in some sense completes the throw of thrownness. (Hence §38 "Falling and Thrownness," and the descriptions of Dasein as fallingly thrown (SZ 406, 411, 412) and "thrown and falling" (SZ 286, 415, 424)).

Why are thrownness and falling linked in this way? The aspect of facticity/thrownness that delivers Dasein over to falling/inauthenticity is the "factical tendency to cover up" (SZ 256). Indeed, facticity is said to be the source of untruth generally, although Heidegger does not explain why "to be closed off and covered up belongs to Dasein's facticity" (SZ 222). The claim that the veiled whence and whither of thrownness are "constitutive for Dasein's facticity" (SZ 348) looks like a clue, but Heidegger's point here is that the darkness of the whence and whither belongs essentially to thrownness and is not a contingent deficiency. That is, he has used "facticity" to mean "thrownness." (For other conflations and confusions of the two, see SZ 276, 284, 415.)

So the story of a non-motivated inauthenticity based on thrownness is, at best, underdeveloped in *Being and Time*. The relationship between thrownness and inauthenticity is thus unclear on both the motivated and non-motivated stories. Further, the latter story may work only if we collapse thrownness into facticity, facticity into the structural phenomenon of falling, and this falling into inauthentic falling.

In his middle period, Heidegger associates thrownness more with facticity than with inauthenticity's successor concepts. But his most frequent appeals to thrownness are to what he once called "pure" thrownness (SZ 343): Dasein thrownness into the there (*da*) and into truth; i.e., its being thrown open so as to be the site of being. It is this thrownness that is the same as or part of adaptation (*Ereignis*, e.g., GA65:304, 407, 453).

Katherine Withy

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 134–36, 179, 228, 276, 284–87, 325–26, 328, 340, 342–43, 348, 374, 383–84; GA9:327/249, 330/252, 337/257, 342/260, 350/266; GA65:239, 304, 446–48, 452–55

204.
TIME (*ZEIT*)

WE MAY DISTINGUISH an undifferentiated use of the word "time" and its derivatives in Heidegger's corpus, in which they refer to time as we ordinarily understand it, from more technical uses of the words, which occur predominantly in the period from 1924 to 1929. Heidegger also makes notable use of "time" in his late lecture "Time and Being" (GA14).

1   THE UNDIFFERENTIATED USE OF THE WORD "TIME"

Time (as understood in the undifferentiated use of the word) is a flow or sequence (*Ablauf, Folge*) of Nows.[1] Aristotle best captured this phenomenon, and his account was accepted uncritically by the philosophical tradition after him, Heidegger avers (SZ 421). Time is what is counted in the measurement of change or movement, paradigmatically in following the moving hand of a clock.

Heidegger characterizes the experience of time in this ordinary manner as "reckoning with time," and analyzes it more technically as Enpresenting (*Gegenwärtigen*) in unity with Retaining (*Behalten*) and AWAITING (*Gewärtigen*). Enpresenting discloses the present (SZ 338). Retaining and Awaiting "temporalize out of," that is, are determined by the dominance of Enpresenting. Thus, in Retaining DASEIN understands the past as a present that no longer is, in Awaiting the future as a present that is to come. This mode of understanding time is "Awaiting-Retaining Enpresenting" (*gewärtigend-behaltendes Gegenwärtigen*). Thus understood, the present, past, and future are all Nows. The Now is "what is counted in the concernful measurement of time" (SZ 422). Watching the moving hand of the clock, Dasein can say "now." Awaiting-Retaining Enpresenting expresses itself in language as "saying-Now" (SZ 416). Further, the Now is a unit of time, for Nows are arranged into a sequence of Nows. The Now-sequence takes at least two different forms: "the ordinary conception of time" (*vulgärer Zeitbegriff*) and "world-time" (*Weltzeit*). At this point we move beyond undifferentiated uses of the word "time."

2   THE ORDINARY UNDERSTANDING OF TIME AND WORLD-TIME

World-time has four defining features: datability, significance, spannedness, and publicity. Some event or process delineates the Now and thereby dates it. In the first instance, Nows are datable by events or actions that are appropriate for the respective Now (SZ 414). Because concern is occupied with conducting Dasein's everyday business, every now (e.g., dinner time) is appropriate

---

[1] I shall capitalize "Now" when its use is technical and nominalized. I shall do the same for "Earlier," "Later," "Present," "Future." In order to maintain parity in capitalization, I will also capitalize parallel terms, even when they don't need to be distinguished from an ordinary use, such as "Beenness."

for some things (eating, conversation), inappropriate for others (belching). Heidegger calls this structure of appropriateness the *significance* of time. This terminological choice explicitly connects the analysis with the structure of significance in §18 of *Being and Time* (SZ 414).

The actions or events that date time themselves take time, or last, so the Now has "duration" (*Dauer*) or "span" (*Spanne*, *Spannweite*). This spannedness (*Gespanntheit*) of world-time is grounded in the stretchedness (*Erstrecktheit*) of historical temporality.

Finally, world-time is public (*öffentlich*) because it is disclosed in discursive saying-now.

> The expressed "now" is said by each [speaker] in the publicness of being-with-one-another-in-the-world. The interpreted expressed time of the current Dasein has therefore as such *been made public* [*veröffentlicht*] on the ground of its ecstatic BEING-IN-THE-WORLD. (SZ 411)

World-time has always already been made public through Dasein's expressive saying-now (see Discourse).

World-time is thus a sequence of datable, significant, spanned, and public Nows. The ordinary conception of time, however, lacks at least the first two of these features (SZ 422). These structures are covered up (*verdeckt*) in the ordinary conception of time, which "levels down" (*nivelliert*) the understanding of time as world-time. Stripped of datability and significance, time becomes a "pure one-after-another" (*pures Nacheinander*).

The PUBLICNESS of time entails that "several [speakers] can say 'now' in such a way that each dates the spoken 'now' differently" (SZ 411): Dinner time for one can be TV time for another. Natural processes (such as the rising and setting of the sun) or artificial processes dependent on natural process (such as the movement of the hand of a clock) can play the role of lowest common denominator of reference. However one might date the current Now in a worldly fashion, it is now when the clock strikes six, or now when the sun sets. This form of dating is shorn of the significance that characterizes world-time. The event that dates the Now effaces itself.

Finally, the ordinary conception of time interprets time as an entity, specifically an OCCUR-RENT entity (SZ 423). Time, however, is not an entity. To understand this feature of the ordinary conception of time we must turn to time as the horizon of the understanding of being.

3 TIME AS THE HORIZON FOR THE UNDERSTANDING OF BEING

On the first page of *Being and Time* Heidegger promises that,

> the intention of the treatise that follows is to concretely work out the question about the SENSE of "*being*." The interpretation of *time* as the possible horizon of any such understanding of being at all is its preliminary goal. (SZ 1)

The preparatory target of ontological analysis is the being of Dasein, and the sense of the being of Dasein is TEMPORALITY (*Zeitlichkeit*, SZ 17). Heidegger fleshes out the language of "horizons" with his account of the "ecstatic-horizonal" character of temporality. Ecstasy and horizon constitute a parallelism between understanding (ecstasy) and what is understood (horizon). It is structurally similar to the noetic-noematic correlation at the heart of Husserl's mature analysis of intentionality. It is modeled on Heidegger's interpretation of Kant's Schematism.

In the Schematism chapter of *The Critique of Pure Reason*, Kant argues that time connects the Categories of the pure understanding (e.g., substance and inherence, ground and consequence) with experience. Specifically, each Category has a determinate Schema, which is a temporal pattern. The Category of ground and consequence is "schematized" by the Schema of succession in time. The details of Kant's analysis are not important here. The *model* is: the understanding is connected to its object at the most basic level by a "mapping" onto temporal patterns. In place of Category and Schema Heidegger identifies pairs of ecstasy and horizonal schema. An ecstasy is an "enrapturing to … " (*Entrückung zu …*) something with a definite form and so bears an internal relation to a "horizonal schema" (SZ 365; see Ecstasis).

Heidegger identifies a trio of ecstatic-horizonal pairs for each mode of the understanding of time. For example, originary temporality has three ecstasies, aligned with future, past, and present. In the Future (of originary temporality) Dasein is enraptured to the "for the sake of itself" (*Umwillen seiner*, SZ 327, 365). Similarly, in Beenness (the originary past) Dasein is carried away to "the in-the-face-of-which of thrownness or the to-which of being-delivered-over" (SZ 365). Heidegger names the distinctive present of originary temporality "Present" (*Gegenwart*) and characterizes it as a "letting-encounter of" (*Begegnenlassens von …*, SZ 328–29). "The horizonal schema of the *Present* is determined by the *in-order-to*" (SZ 365). This trio of ecstatic-horizonal pairs is dominated by the Future: "*the primary phenomenon of originary and authentic temporality is the Future*" (SZ 329).

"Reckoning with time" or "concern with [*besorgen um*] time" has a different trio of ecstatic-horizonal pairs: Retaining (*Behalten*) the Earlier, Awaiting (*Gewärtigen*) the Later, and Enpresenting (*Gegenwärtigen*) the Now (SZ 420–21). In this mode of temporal understanding Enpresenting dominates: the Earlier is the no-longer-Now, while the Later is the not-yet-Now. To signal this dominance Heidegger describes it as "Awaiting-Retaining Enpresenting." He adds, what shows itself on the horizon of the Earlier, the Now, and the Later is time.

What does it mean to say that time is the "horizon" of the understanding of being? At the most general level, Heidegger explains that in "naive" ontological reflection time has functioned as a criterion for drawing distinctions among several regions of being (SZ 18), e.g., between "the 'timeless' [*zeitlosen*] sense of propositions" and the "'temporal' activity of expressing propositions" (SZ 18). So, traditional philosophical distinctions, such as that between being and becoming, count as "naive" ontological reflection.

Heidegger's aim is not to intervene in and correct traditional ontological discussions, but rather to identify ecstatic-horizonal structures alternative to the Retaining-Awaiting Enpresenting that discloses the horizon of the Earlier, Now, and Later. Heidegger's principal alternative is originary temporality. Before turning to the analysis of originary temporality, let us return to Heidegger's denial that time is an entity.

"Temporality 'is' no *entity* at all [*überhaupt kein Seiendes*]. It is not, but rather *temporalizes* [*zeitigt sich*]" (SZ 328). In *Basic Problems* Heidegger adds: "time cannot be called an entity at all [*überhaupt*]" (GA24:463), a statement he repeats in 1962, in "Time and Being" (see below). Just as it is improper to write "being is," so it is improper to write "time is" or "temporality is." This (plausibly) explains Heidegger's otherwise peculiar formulation, "temporality temporalizes" (*die Zeit zeitigt sich*).[2] Sometimes, especially when he uses it with the preposition *aus* ("out of," or

---

[2] Macquarrie and Robinson translate this expression as "time temporalizes itself," but *sich zeitigen* is a so-called "true reflexive verb." Just as "*ich eile mich*" means "I'm rushing" or "I'm in a hurry," so *die Zeit zeitigt sich* simply means "time temporalizes."

"in terms of"), it seems to have the sense of "to generate," which is an ordinary sense of the verb. On other occasions he uses *sich zeitigen* as a simple replacement for "to be." When he uses it in this manner, it parallels other formulations designed to avoid saying "*x* is": "there is being" (*es gibt Sein*), "the NOTHING nothings" (*das Nichts nichtet*, in "What is Metaphysics?" GA9:116/92), or "the world worlds" (*die Welt weltet*, in "The Origin of the Work of Art," GA5:30/23).

What then is time insofar as it is a horizon for the understanding of being? Horizonal schemata constitute specific ways of understanding time. Now-time is understood in terms of the Earlier and Later. The Earlier and Later make up the conceptual framework of temporal sequence. Heidegger calls this "intratemporality" (*Innerzeitigkeit*, SZ §80). It is a *structure* of ordered Nows that makes up the horizon for understanding entities unlike Dasein. The structure is not a series of moments or Nows. It is not an entity, but rather an ontological framework in terms of which entities can be understood. For this reason, it *is* not, but rather *temporalizes*.

But are the Nows themselves, and the sequence they form, entities? Yes, they are, or at least, so they are understood in the ordinary conception of time. Here we confront a tension (perhaps even a contradiction) between Heidegger's denial that time *is* at all and his acceptance that "*the ordinary representation of time has its natural right*" (SZ 426), that time as so understood is a "genuine time-phenomenon" (*echtes Zeit-phänomen*, SZ 333). So, following the grand scholastic tradition in which Heidegger was steeped, we probably should distinguish (1) time insofar as it is a horizon for the understanding of being, which is not an entity, and (2) the sequence of Nows (a derivative yet genuine phenomenon), which is an entity.

4   TEMPORALITY (*ZEITLICHKEIT*)

Temporality temporalizes in the unity of the ecstases Future, Present, and Beenness. "Beenness" is a neologism, but "Future" and "Present" are ordinary temporal terms. It is natural, therefore, to interpret them as referring to the future (what comes later or afterwards), the present (what is now), and the past (what came earlier or beforehand). Notice, however, that this would be to interpret temporality within the framework of Now-time (the Earlier and the Later). The temptation to do so is "naive." In §65 Heidegger "*forbids*" us to interpret the temporal sense of the ecstasies of temporality "in terms of the ordinary understanding of time." He continues,

> "ahead" [in "ahead-of-itself," one way Heidegger characterizes the Future] does not mean "in advance" in the sense of "not yet now, but later"; likewise, "already" [in "already-in-a-world"] does not mean "no longer now, but earlier." If the expressions "ahead" and "already" had *this* timelike meaning [*zeithafte Bedeutung*], which they can indeed have, then temporality would be said to be something that can in particular be "earlier" and "later," "not yet" and "no longer." Care would then be grasped as an entity that occurs and runs its course "in time." The *being* of an entity of the character of Dasein would be transformed into something *occurrent*. (SZ 327)

This passage points to two errors that can arise in interpreting the being of Dasein.

First, there is a tendency in traditional philosophical reflection to treat being as if it were an entity, which violates one of Heidegger's most fundamental principles, the Ontological Difference. Care is the being of Dasein, not an entity, and therefore does not occur and run

its course in time. In the next sentence he points out that interpreting temporality in terms of the Earlier and Later would, further, be to construe the being of Dasein as something occurrent. This compounds collapsing the Ontological Difference with misunderstanding Dasein as something occurrent. It is a double error.

Second, to interpret Dasein as occurrent is to deploy the incorrect ecstatic-horizonal framework. To understand something as (broadly) occurrent is to construe it on the horizon of the Earlier and Later.[3] To understand Dasein, therefore, requires a different trio of paired ecstasies and horizons. Future (ecstasy) is enraptured to the for-the-sake-of-itself, which is roughly a teleological phenomenon: Dasein presses ahead into who it purposes to be.[4] Beenness is enraptured to the in-the-face-of-which/to-which, which is roughly an affective or situational phenomenon: Dasein finds itself already thrown into a world and already differentially caring about the possibilities and things that populate that world. Present is enraptured to the in-order-to, which is what connects entities unlike Dasein to Dasein: it is what binds the available to the significance of the world, which co-constitutes the being of Dasein as being-in-the-world. This is clearly not a "temporal" structure in the traditional sense; it is not defined by the Earlier and Later. It is a set of time-like characteristics or aspects. So, why does Heidegger call it "temporality"?

5   THE ORIGIN OF TIME IN ORIGINARY TEMPORALITY

Here we arrive at one of Heidegger's murkiest doctrines. He writes,

> Hence, if the "time" that is accessible to the intelligibility of Dasein is demonstrated to be *not* originary but rather arising out of [*entspringend aus*] authentic temporality, then in accordance with the proposition, *a potiori fit denominatio*, we are justified in naming the temporality that has now been exposed *originary time*. (SZ 329)

Before trying to interpret this passage in detail, we must smooth out a couple of wrinkles. First, the statement is a conditional: if two conditions hold, then we are justified. . . . Heidegger clearly intends to discharge the conditional, but at this point in the text (§65) he has not yet done so. He does so in chapters 4 and 5 of Division II. If the statement were a mere hypothetical, then we would not be justified in calling temporality "originary time," and so it would be hard to understand why we should use a word related to time to name temporality at all.

Second, time as it is ordinarily understood "arises out of" *authentic* temporality. This intersects with the distinction between authenticity and inauthenticity. Throughout §65 Heidegger argues repeatedly that inauthentic temporality arises out of authentic and that ordinary time does so as well. This suggests, but does not strictly imply, that successive Now-time is an inauthentic phenomenon. The derivation of successive Now-time from authentic temporality proceeds in two stages: inauthentic temporality arises from authentic temporality, and the

---

[3] Throughout SZ Heidegger uses "occurrent" in two ways, broadly to refer to anything unlike Dasein, and narrowly to refer to entities unlike Dasein that are independent of the world, hence not available.

[4] The exact language we should use here will depend upon the results of our analysis of the concept of self-understanding. "Purpose" is probably the wrong word. Consider it here a placeholder for however one ends up interpreting the for-the-sake-of-which.

ordinary conception of time arises from inauthentic temporality (SZ 330–31). Let us consider each of these derivations in turn.

6   AUTHENTIC AND INAUTHENTIC TEMPORALITY

The ecstases of authentic temporality are Running-ahead (*Vorlaufen*), Recollection (*Wiederholen*), and the MOMENT (*Augenblick*), and they contrast with the inauthentic ecstases of Awaiting (*Gewärtigen*), Forgetting (*Vergessen*), and Not-dwelling (*Unverweilen*) or Residencelessness (*Aufenthaltslosigkeit*). A proper analysis of these concepts requires a thorough understanding of the distinction between authentic and inauthentic existence. In the present context we can only develop brief characterizations of the phenomena named.

In the authentic future Dasein Runs Ahead into death (*vorlaufen in den Tod*, SZ 325, 336), whereas in the inauthentic future Dasein Awaits successes and failures as determined by everyday tasks and goals (SZ 337). Heidegger's use of the term "Awaiting" is telling. Awaiting is the future ecstasy in which Dasein understands the entities unlike Dasein: Dasein awaits events that are to come. Death, however one might interpret the term in its Heideggerian usage, is not an event whose arrival one Awaits (SZ 261). Death is futural not as something to-come, but rather as that FOR-THE-SAKE-OF-WHICH Dasein exists.

In the authentic past Dasein Recollects (re-collects, gathers up again, *wieder-holt*) that in the face of which it has been thrown, that to which it has been delivered over. That is, in the authentic past Dasein takes over who it has-been.[5] In the inauthentic past Dasein Forgets (fails to recollect) who it has-been. This is not a matter of how one relates to what has happened, to the past or what is gone by (*Vergangenheit*), and so Forgetting is not simply losing track of what has happened. Rather, it is a matter of how one relates to one's ownmost ABILITY-TO-BE. In Running Ahead into death, Dasein *collects* itself *again* (SZ 339), implicitly from its dispersal in the ANYONE (*das Man*). In Forgetting Dasein does not so collect itself and thus remains dispersed in the anyone, so that it understands itself in terms of the worldly successes and failures it is afforded. Who it has-been is misinterpreted as who it was or has been (without the hyphen): the successes and failures it has reckoned up to-date.

In the authentic present Dasein "lets what can be as available or occurrent 'in a time' *first encounter*" (SZ 338).[6] The Moment "brings existence into the Situation and discloses the authentic 'THERE'" (SZ 347). In the resolute disclosure of the Situation Dasein "already acts" (SZ 300) and uncovers for the first time what is factically possible (SZ 299). This is a form of clear-sightedness and surely explains Heidegger's affinity for the Kierkegaardian term "Moment" (*Augenblick*; Danish: *øjeblik*), which names the present by a metaphor for vision, as does Paul in *1 Corinthians* with "the twinkling of an eye," importantly translated by Luther as *Augenblick*. The inauthentic present covers up the authentic Situation by immersing Dasein in "the general position" (*die "allgemeine Lage"*), which is defined by the "closest 'opportunities'" and the "reckoning up of 'accidents'" (SZ 300). Whether the ecstasies temporalize out of a present that "leaps after" (*nachspringt*) the closest opportunities and thereby "runs away from"

---

[5] I hyphenate "has-been" to mimic Heidegger's phrasing, *bin-gewesen*.

[6] In a tangled paragraph at SZ 338, Heidegger indicates that all present ecstasies are forms of enpresenting, but that he will often use the term "enpresenting" to designate the inauthentic mode of enpresenting. Surely this is an unwise terminological policy. For this reason, I use the somewhat more descriptive language Heidegger deploys later on in describing the inauthentic Present: not-dwelling or residencelessness.

(*entlaufen*) the authentic Situation, or rather one that presses ahead into the Situation, defines the specifically temporal difference here.

7   ORIGINARY TEMPORALITY AND TIME

In this last characterization we can begin to see Heidegger's vision of how time as it is ordinarily understood arises out of originary temporality. Time as it is ordinarily understood is a sequence of Nows. The understanding of the Now involves a future and past that are defined as Nows that are to come and have gone by; the Now dominates the understanding. In authentic and originary temporality, the Future dominates the structure of the understanding. In inauthentic temporality Enpresenting dominates the understanding of time.

It is not clear, however, whether Heidegger intends to argue that the understanding of time as Now-time is inauthentic. There is evidence that cuts both ways. On the one hand, he characterizes the ordinary conception of time as "leveled down," and offers the general principle that "all 'arising' in the ontological field is degeneration" (SZ 334). On the other hand, he insists that Now-time is a "genuine time-phenomenon." How one resolves this question will interact with one's approach to other large-scale interpretive questions in SZ, such as whether Dasein's engagement with the world of everyday concerns is somehow inauthentic and a cover-up or flight from some darker or at least deeper truth about human existence.

8   THE PLACE OF THE ANALYSIS OF ORIGINARY TEMPORALITY IN HEIDEGGER'S CORPUS

This highly distinctive analysis of originary temporality as a non-successive manifold of time-like characteristics or aspects that define the being of Dasein is limited in Heidegger's corpus to the period right around *Being and Time*. In the unpublished manuscript *Der Begriff der Zeit* (GA64),[7] which many regard as the "first draft" of *Being and Time*, we do see much of the same apparatus, though with varying terminology. Importantly, we do see here the distinction between temporality (*Zeitlichkeit*) and time (*Zeit*). This manuscript was written in 1924, but the radical ideas with which Heidegger was experimenting do not show up in his lectures in 1924–26.

In GA20 (1925) Heidegger promises a "history of the concept of time," or at least a prolegomena thereto, and promises also to connect the analysis of time with that of being.[8] He gives no indication of the more radical analysis to come in SZ. The next semester (1925–26) he refers to the "more radical temporal possibilities to be found in the temporality of human existence" (GA21:415), but he does not develop them. It is really only in the unpublished *Begriff der Zeit*, *Being and Time*, and *Basic Problems* (GA24) that Heidegger develops these "more radical" possibilities in any detail.

There are two other discussions in Heidegger's corpus informed by the temporal logic of temporality (in the technical sense), without all the apparatus of SZ, however. First, in the 1920–21 *Introduction to the Phenomenology of Religion* (GA60), Heidegger interprets the second

---

[7] Not to be confused with the lecture by the same name that he delivered to the Marburger Theologenschaft in 1924.
[8] Some apparent contradictions between GA20 and SZ can be resolved by noting the terminological variations between the various texts. E.g., in GA64 he uses *Vergangensein* where he uses *Gewesenheit* in SZ, and so his statement that "the being of having-been [*das Sein des Gewesenseins*] is the past [*Vergangenheit*]" (GA20:442) can be reconciled with SZ.

coming (the *parousia*) of Pauline Christianity not as an impending event, but rather as an existential stance.

> The sense of the "When," of the time in which the Christian lives, has an entirely special character.... It is a time without its own order and fixed positions [*feste Stellen*]. One cannot capture this temporality with any objective concept of time. The When is in no way objectively graspable. (GA60:104)

The When of the second coming is, rather, "determined through the *How*" of Christian life, a form of loving hope (GA60:150–51).

In the *Beiträge* (GA65) Heidegger deploys a non-successive temporal logic in describing "the INCEPTION" (*Anfang*). The inception is an unsurpassable (*unüberholbar*)[9] beginning that must be constantly recollected (*wiederholt*) and that "grasps in advance" (*vorausgreifen*). If the inception were an event that lay in the past, then it surely would be surpassable: we would have surpassed it as time passed. It is a past, therefore, that does not belong to what has gone by, the "past" (*Vergangenheit*) in the ordinary sense. It is a past, moreover, that encompasses the future that it grasps in advance. This is the temporal logic that Heidegger uses to describe originary temporality in *Being and Time*, and therefore it is not surprising to see him characterize such an inception as originary (*ursprünglich*) in *Beiträge*.

The final distinctive use of "time" we should note is in the late lecture "Time and Being" (GA14). Here Heidegger reiterates his thesis that time is not an entity (GA14:7, 9). Time is the framework in terms of which being is understood. However, unlike during the period of 1924–29, the discussion of time here remains fully lodged in the logic of successive, Now-time. He focuses instead on the way in which the future (*Zukunft*) gives what is, but also as absent, specifically as not yet present; the past (*Gewesen*) gives what is, but as absent in the manner of no longer present. This peculiar intertwining of presence and absence constitutes the distinctive nature of "authentic temporality" (*eigentliche Zeitlichkeit*). The three "dimensions" (*Dimensionen*) of time are what they are in virtue of this distinctive intertwining, which Heidegger calls "the fourth dimension of time," "nearness" (*Nahheit*). So, at this late stage of his career, Heidegger retains the intimate relation between time and being, time's function as a horizon of the intelligibility of being, but he abandons the non-successive temporality of *Being and Time*. This parallels his full embrace in the lecture of the thesis that being is (and has always been) presence, something that he denies during the *Being and Time* period (see TEMPORALITY).

William Blattner

FURTHER READING

Blattner 1999, Fleischer 1991, Käufer 2013, McMullin 2013

---

[9] The same word Heidegger uses to characterize death in SZ.

205.
TOPOLOGY (*TOPOLOGIE*)

Topology (topologie) is the "saying of place" (a meaning that can be derived directly from the two contained terms, *topos*, meaning "place," and *logos*). "Topology" figures only in Heidegger's later writings and then rarely. The term appears in Heidegger's exchange with Ernst Jünger where topology (there distinguished from topography, *Topographie*) is described as a "discussion [*Erörterung*] locating that locale which gathers being and nothing into their essence" (GA9:412/311). In the "Le Thor Seminar," Heidegger seems to suggest that topology is the fundamental mode for the thinking of being – "topology of beyng" (*Topologie des Seyns*) thus addresses the "question of the place of beyng" (*Frage dem Ort oder der Ortschaft des Seyns*) (GA15:335/41, 344/47). The first occurrence of "topology," which is also the first occurrence of "topology of being," is in Heidegger's *Notebooks* from 1946 (GA97:201–02), where "place" (*Ort/Ortschaft*) and "place of beyng" (*Ortschaft des Seyns*) also figure.

Jeff Malpas

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA9:412/311, 447/338; GA13:84/PLT 12; GA15:335/41, 344/47

FURTHER READING

Malpas 2012, Pöggeler 1975

206.
TRANSCENDENCE (*TRANSZENDENZ*)

Tᴀɴsᴄᴇɴᴅᴇɴᴄᴇ ɪs ᴀ movement of surpassing or stepping beyond, and takes many different forms. It can involve a surpassing the contents of ᴄᴏɴsᴄɪᴏᴜsɴᴇss out to the things themselves; it can involve a surpassing of entities to the ᴡᴏʀʟᴅ as their ground; it can involve a stepping beyond entities to ʙᴇɪɴɢ itself; and it can involve a surpassing of being to the ᴄʟᴇᴀʀɪɴɢ, or surpassing the current prevailing understanding of being toward a new ᴀᴅᴀᴘᴛᴀᴛɪᴏɴ (*Ereignis*).

In the late 1920s, the notion of transcendence assumes a position of fundamental importance for Heidegger. The centrality of this notion in Heidegger's thought, during these years, can be seen both in works written for publication, including *Being and Time* (1927), "The Essence of Ground" (1928, GA9), and *Kant and the Problem of Metaphysics* (1929, GA3); as well as in posthumously published lecture courses, such as *Basic Problems of Phenomenology* (1927, GA24) and *The Metaphysical Foundations of Logic* (1928, GA26). In these works, Heidegger identifies transcendence with the way of being of Dᴀsᴇɪɴ, in some passages equating transcendence with ʙᴇɪɴɢ-ɪɴ-ᴛʜᴇ-ᴡᴏʀʟᴅ, in others with the ᴜɴᴅᴇʀsᴛᴀɴᴅɪɴɢ of being, and in still others simply maintaining that Dasein is transcendence. Hence, the importance of this notion. That is, just as being-in-the-world and the understanding of being are articulations of Dasein's structure, articulations that differ insofar as they emphasize different aspects of Dasein; so transcendence is such an articulation, with its own distinctive emphases. Thus, Heidegger's discussions of transcendence constitute one of his approaches to what was his main preoccupation during the period in which his magnum opus, *Being and Time*, appeared, i.e., the analytic of Dasein. Regarding this connection between transcendence and the project of *Being and Time*, Heidegger goes so far as to claim that the entirety of *Being and Time* can be understood as a "progressive elaboration of transcendence" (GA26:214).

What distinguishes transcendence from other articulations of Dasein's structure is the specific philosophical heritage from which this notion arose. Heidegger begins to articulate this heritage by noting that, etymologically, "transcendence" means "to surpass, to step over, to cross over to" (GA26:204; see also GA9:137/107; GA24:423). And in any surpassing, Heidegger points out, there is "that *toward which* such surpassing occurs," as well as "*something* that is surpassed in this surpassing" (GA9:137/107). The traditional philosophical conception of transcendence, inaugurated in the modern period by Descartes, specifies these aspects of surpassing by conceiving transcendence as the subject's crossing over from its internal cabinet of immanence, surpassing the border of this self-enclosed realm of consciousness, thereby crossing over to externally existing entities. Transcendence, then, refers to the subject's accessing of entities; and this gaining of access is conceived in the above manner, insofar as modern philosophers accepted "the traditional concept of the epistemological sᴜʙᴊᴇᴄᴛ–ᴏʙᴊᴇᴄᴛ relation" (GA26:214). That is, they assumed that the relation between the subject and the entities toward which it transcends is such that they are essentially separate, simply beside one another. As Heidegger puts it, their relation is interpreted as mere "being-ᴏᴄᴄᴜʀʀᴇɴᴛ together"

(GA26:160). This presupposition, then, determines the heritage from which the notion of transcendence that Heidegger addresses originated.

Given the assumption of the modern subject–object relation, the traditional *problem* of transcendence asks how such an isolated subject's crossing over to entities is possible. It asks how that subject transcends its inner sphere in order to access the external world. This is why the problem of transcendence, in the modern period, typically takes the form of the problem of the external world, asking how we can be sure that there is a world of objects beyond our isolated cabinet of subjectivity; or how we can be sure that our experiences surpass this internal realm, thereby crossing over to externally existing entities. And, according to Heidegger, the problem is irresolvable in this form. For an isolated subject would only have access to its own internal realm, and so could never arrive at the terminal point of its alleged transcendence, at that toward which such purported surpassing occurs (see GA24:88–90). Given this irresolvability, the modern subject–object ONTOLOGY must be repudiated in favor of a revised conception of subjectivity, and of its transcendence. This repudiation and revision, Heidegger maintains, had been begun, but not fully accomplished, by contemporary phenomenologists, such as Brentano, Husserl, and Scheler (see GA26:165–69).

PHENOMENOLOGY had made a significant advance, with regard to the problem of transcendence and its view of the subject–object relation, through the principle of INTENTIONALITY. For this principle defines consciousness as intrinsically directed toward objects, thereby recognizing that subjectivity is necessarily related to objects, that the subject's being related to objects is definitive of its very way of being. This recognition allowed phenomenology to move beyond the modern subject–object ontology, insofar as the intentional subject, so defined, is not the self-enclosed, isolated subject assumed by modern thought. In repudiating that conception of subjectivity, the phenomenological adoption of the principle of intentionality resolves the traditional problem of transcendence. For a subject that is not essentially isolated need not surpass the border of its allegedly internal realm of consciousness in order to gain access to externally existing objects. Instead, the intentional subject's way of being is to be with objects, in commerce with them, "out" among them. As Heidegger puts it, "a disclosive being-by-things belongs to EXISTENCE" (GA26:162). And insofar as the intentional subject is recognized as ontologically out among entities, its transcendence, its accessing entities, ceases to be a problem.

However, although Heidegger believes that the phenomenological repudiation of the modern subject–object ontology, and its revision of the subject as intentional, "supplant[s] the pseudo-problem" of transcendence as traditionally understood (GA26:168), this repudiation and revision, as was mentioned above, are begun, but not fully accomplished, by the phenomenological adoption of the principle of intentionality. For, according to Heidegger, acknowledging that the subject is necessarily intentional demands a complete reconceptualization of what it is to be a subject, of the way of being that Heidegger names Dasein; and contemporary phenomenology has failed to carry out this project. As Heidegger makes the point, "The insight into intentionality does not go far enough to see that grasping this structure as the essential structure of Dasein must revolutionize the whole concept of the human being" (GA26:167). Therefore, Heidegger does not consider the problem of transcendence, of the subject's access to entities, to be resolved by simply acknowledging, without fully explicating, the intentionality of the subject, and so he "makes intentionality itself into a problem" (GA26:168). That is, he undertakes the

explication of the intentional subject's ontological structure – what *Being and Time* calls the analytic of Dasein.

Within the context of the problem of transcendence, Heidegger pursues the analytic of Dasein by asking how the subject's essential intentionality is possible. What about the subject's ontology gives it its directedness toward, and thus its access to, entities? Heidegger's answer is that the way of being of Dasein is a kind of surpassing, a kind of transcendence. This transcendence, however, is not that of the traditional problem of transcendence; it is not the modern epistemological subject's surpassing of its internal sphere, a surpassing toward entities. Rather than this kind of transcendence, whose possibility is explained (away) by the phenomenological principle of intentionality, Heidegger invokes a kind of transcendence that explains the possibility of intentionality itself: "intentionality is founded in the Dasein's transcendence" (GA24:230; see also GA26:170; GA9:135/106). Here, we find the specifically Heideggerian notion of transcendence, which takes on the aforementioned position of fundamental importance for Heidegger in the late 1920s.

The transcendence that is definitive of Dasein is not a surpassing *toward* entities, but rather a surpassing *of* entities. As Heidegger puts it, "What is surpassed is precisely and solely *entities themselves*" (GA9:138/108; see also GA26:212). And since this transcendence makes intentionality possible, Heidegger's position is that the intentional subject's being directed toward entities, its being out among them, is possible because its way of being is to surpass, to be beyond, those very entities toward which it is directed. Heidegger's reasons for maintaining this position can be understood through his characterizations of that toward which transcendence surpasses entities.

On the one hand, when Heidegger identifies transcendence with being-in-the-world, he maintains that "That toward which the subject transcends is what we call world" (GA26:212; see also GA9:139/109; GA24:424–25). And he specifies this transcendence toward world as an "antecedent understanding" of world (GA24:424). The intentional subject, then, is able to access entities insofar as it possesses a precursory understanding of world, which determines it as being-in-the-world, i.e, as transcendence. This claim, that it is a precursory understanding that renders entities accessible, is repeated in Heidegger's identification of transcendence with the understanding of being, although in this case that toward which the subject transcends, that of which it has a precursory understanding, is being (see GA26:170; GA9:169–70/130–31; GA3:123, 235).

The understanding of being gives the intentional subject access to entities, or as Heidegger puts it, "secures the possibility of entities manifesting themselves as entities" (GA26:170; see also GA9:169–70/130; GA3:226–27), insofar as the subject must have some comprehension of what it is to be, some comprehension of being, in order to recognize entities as entities that are at all. Similarly, the understanding of world provides a comprehension without which entities cannot be recognized as such. For by "world," in this context, Heidegger refers to what he also calls worldhood, or significance (see SZ 86–87). Worldhood, or significance, is the fundamental structure of the environment within which, and in terms of which, entities are. Since entities only are in terms of world in this sense, they can only appear to the intentional subject if that subject comprehends world, comprehends the basic structure that determines them as entities.

In view of the above, Heideggerian transcendence is the surpassing of entities, accomplished through the intentional subject's antecedent understanding of the ontological structure of those entities, thereby rendering them accessible. Finally, in order for this surpassing of entities to

situate the subject out among the entities that it makes accessible, the subject must not only surpass entities, but must return to the entities that it has surpassed (see GA9:165/127; GA24:424). That is, as equipped with the understanding provided by its surpassing of entities, the intentional subject can exist in commerce with entities. The basic ontological structure of the intentional subject, that which makes its intentionality possible, then, is the surpassing of, and return to, entities as such – i.e., transcendence. To be characterized by transcendence, in this sense, is to be in the manner of Dasein.

Heidegger's notion of transcendence serves to "revolutionize the whole concept of the human being" insofar as the surpassing of, and return to, entities is not merely an activity that the intentional subject performs. As Heidegger puts it, "Dasein does not sort of exist and then occasionally achieve a crossing over outside itself" (GA26:211). Instead, to be in the manner of Dasein is to exist such that the surpassing of, and return to, entities is "always already" accomplished. That is, insofar as Dasein exists, it has already transcended to being and returned to entities, thereby existing in commerce with them. Dasein's understanding of being, along with its return to entities, is not a series of acts that the subject performs, but is constitutive of its very ontological structure; transcendence is "the essence of the subject, … the fundamental structure of subjectivity" (GA9:137–38/108). Dasein does not perform an act of transcendence, but rather Dasein *is* transcendence. And the explication of the Dasein-structure requires a revolutionary concept of the human being since Dasein can only have always already comprehended being if Dasein is characterized by a unique, and previously unrecognized, mode of temporality.

Heidegger defines transcendental philosophy as that which "inquires into the possibility, i.e., as to the essence of this transcendence which characterizes the understanding of being" (GA3:116). It is in this sense that Heidegger's pursuit of the meaning of being, as carried out in the period under consideration, can be characterized as transcendental. And it is with this conception of transcendental philosophy in mind that Heidegger sees Kant's thought as a particularly instructive precursor to *Being and Time* (see GA24:423; GA3:15–16).

In the 1930s, the so-called TURN (*Kehre*) in Heidegger's thought leads him to reject the approach to the being-question that guided his thought during the previous decade, including its foregrounding of the notion of transcendence. This rejection of transcendence as a guiding theme is clearly announced in the *Contributions to Philosophy*, in which Heidegger characterizes the specifically "'fundamental-ontological' transcendence of *Being and Time*" (GA65:217) as, ultimately, an instantiation of the basic Platonism underlying the history of Western philosophy and its inadequate interpretations of the meaning of being.

Mark Tanzer

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 38, 49, 202, 350, 363–66; GA3:16–17, 42, 70–71, 85–92, 116–20; GA9:126/99, 135ff./105ff., 152/118, 158ff./122ff.; GA24:89–91, 161, 180–81, 230, 248–49, 311, 379, 423–29, 436, 447, 460–61; GA25:57–59, 63–66, 93, 219, 315–19; GA26:20, 169–71, 177, 194–95, 203–18, 237–38, 245–54, 275–77; GA65:24–26, 216–19, 322

FURTHER READING

Crowell and Malpas 2007, Emad 1981b

207
TRANSITION (*ÜBERGANG*)

A TRANSITION IS a "going-over" or passage from one condition to something else. This idea takes on greater import in Heidegger's later work, where he focuses more on a rather discontinuous history of philosophy. The HISTORY OF BEING takes place in a series of epochs, periods when a culture maintains a relatively stable shared understanding of being – what it means to be – which determines what is worthwhile, reasonable, and all other basic questions of existence for that period (see EPOCHÉ). Like Hegel before and Foucault after him, Heidegger is interested in the way these foundational understandings shift, giving way to new ones.

I find Heidegger oscillating between two ways of conceiving these transitions. One is the broadly Hegelian view that each understanding leads to the next in a way that is at least somewhat comprehensible, allowing us to construct a coherent narrative of the entire process. The pre-Socratics' understanding gathered around truly appearing *phusis* and *a-lêtheia*, but then Plato separated true unchanging being from the physical, changeable, merely apparent world of *phusis*. The history of philosophy since then has been a series of new definitions of what it means to be, or METAPHYSICS, each giving way and transforming into new ones in turn. Broadly, Plato's understanding, governed by the notion of production, turns into *ens creatum* in the Middle Ages with GOD as the ultimate producer and all else as His products. In the modern era, the subject takes the place of God as the determining, producing center of all, until the present age when everything becomes maximally pliable resources for our technological fabrications. On this telling, the entire history of metaphysics is an intelligible development of seeds contained in Plato's founding ideas, making the transitions comprehensible within a consistent narrative of the whole. The plot is of the increasing FORGETFULNESS OF BEING as the variations on Plato's real–unreal division degenerate: "entities in their *emergence* to themselves (ancient Greece); *caused* by a highest instance of their essence (Middle Ages); things present at hand as *objects* (modern era). The TRUTH of BEYNG is veiled more and more" (GA65:171, §84).

At other times, Heidegger subscribes to a more Kierkegaardian-style view of these transitions as "leaps." Here there are no explicable segues but instead sudden mysterious shifts which cannot be explained: "the DESTINY of being makes its way over entities in abrupt epochs of truth" (GA5:210/157). Indeed, the very attempt to explain them furthers the FORGETFULNESS OF BEING (see, e.g., GA65:110–12). This idea is rather Kuhnian[1]: any explanation of the change-over would have to use concepts belonging to one epochal understanding of being or another, preventing them from giving unbiased accounts of the transitions between them (see, e.g., GA45:170–71/171). Retrospective chronicles of deep changes are inescapably Whig, casting new movements as improvements, by the successor's lights of course: as the triumph of God's truth over heathens, say, or rational science overcoming superstition, or pragmatic

---

[1] See the excerpt "Modern Science, Metaphysics, and Mathematics" in BW (GA41:§18) and SZ §3 for clear presentations of this.

technologists easing life's sufferings. Any attempt to compare or adjudicate among the epochs is inherently partisan, as Sextus Empiricus argued, judging by the criteria it itself posits. The incommensurability of the concepts involved renders a neutral narrative of progress or regress impossible.

Regardless of how we understand this, two meta-transitions are involved in the story: the first INCEPTION which initiates metaphysics, and the hoped-for transition from metaphysics in its entirety to what Heidegger sometimes calls the other INCEPTION. His discussion of this latter transition, which all of his work in some sense prepares for, is quite obscure, even for Heidegger, but this is fully appropriate. Any discussion of what a future way of thinking would be like, especially across one of these chasmic meta-transitions, will necessarily be disorienting to those on the near side of it because of how deeply they reorient thought; these transitions redraw the line between common sense and non-sense (see GA41:78–79/WT 78). Heidegger's works don't so much describe this second meta-transition as try to enact it, attempting to draw us across to radically new conceptual territory.

One way to begin is to make the transition from what he calls the guiding question of philosophy to the basic question (GA65:172; GA45:200/199–200). The guiding question, which determines all metaphysics, is the inquiry into the being of entities or their BEINGNESS. This is the set of properties that defines what it means to be, the qualities shared by all entities if they are to be, and this is what the great works of metaphysics express. The basic question, on the other hand, looks beyond these epochal forms of beingness to their source, to the fundamental fact that we have understandings of being at all. Heidegger never stopped trying to find words for this most basic and simple fact, calling it the truth of being, beyng, being itself, and ADAPTATION (*Ereignis*), among others.

Turning from entities to beingness is metaphysics; turning from beingness to being itself would be THINKING. However, being itself is not something above and beyond the manifestation of entities in various forms of beingness; indeed, it is only this occurrence. Thus, we study being itself through these epochal manifestations, which is why the transition to thinking does not abandon metaphysics but, in a sense, brackets it so that it may study what it presupposes. As Derrida says, the transition to overcoming metaphysics will still study it, but in a different way (see Derrida 1997, 24; Derrida 1978b, 36, 288). For Heidegger, this means seeing the epochal understandings as gifts, dispensations sent to us rather than our own creation or simply the intrinsic nature of entities (see ABANDONMENT OF BEING and FORGETFULNESS OF BEING). This transition will instill an attitude of wondrous gratitude in us, showing the entirety of the world as if it were a work of art.

Lee Braver

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA10:136/79, 143/84, 153/91; QCT 153; GA34:17/12; GA45:161/139; QCT 39; GA65:§§84–85, §89; GA65:184–85, §91; SZ 24–26; N4 187, 215, 220; TB 9, 52; GA66:22

208.
TRANSLATION (*ÜBERSETZUNG*)

Translation is a being transposed into an encounter with what is foreign about a foreign language in rendering a linguistic text or utterance into one's native language so that it can be expressed in another language. But Heidegger thinks of linguistic translation as involving a transformed relation to what is foreign within one's own native language and condition by way of this encounter. Although Heidegger does not offer a "translation theory" in the same manner that he does not offer an "aesthetics," beginning in the mid-1930s he becomes increasingly concerned with the question of translation, especially as it pertains to the "spiritual" affinity he understands to prevail between the Greek and German languages. A discussion of Heidegger and translation must therefore address two related issues: first, it must address what Heidegger actually says about translation, together with the peculiar back-and-forth he understands to govern translation and the act of interpretation. And, second, it must address Heidegger as a notoriously idiosyncratic – and even violent – translator.

While Heidegger's etymologies of key Greek terms in the 1920s and early 1930s may be construed as a type of "translation," beginning with the 1935 *Introduction to Metaphysics* Heidegger's orientation toward translation undergoes an identifiable shift. This shift derives from the significance he attaches to Hölderlin's December 4, 1801 "Letter to Böhlendorff" in which Hölderlin outlines what is "foreign" (*das Fremde*) and "native" (*das Eigene*) to the Greeks and the Germans respectively; when Heidegger addresses the question of translation in both the *Ister* (GA53) and *Parmenides* (GA54) lecture courses, he refers to it as the passage through the "foreign" and "native" in which neither term is strictly given on its own but instead comes to be appropriated as the relation to difference between them. Despite the fact that Hölderlin articulates the apportioning of "foreign" and "native" between the Greeks and the Germans as an inverse relation, this symmetry is not the most important aspect of Heidegger's reading of the "Letter." Rather, it is the "paradox" Hölderlin identifies when he writes that "one's own must be learned just as well as the foreign" – but that it is in fact learned with "greater difficulty" and never as well (GA39:290–91). For both Hölderlin and Heidegger after him, translation thus always operates on two levels simultaneously: on one level, it is concerned with the encounter and learning of the foreign qua foreign, and on the other, it is concerned with what is already implied in the confrontation with DIFFERENCE, which first opens the space for entering into explicit relation with the native as one is transposed into its own foreignness through the encounter with the foreign. As Heidegger writes in parsing out what the "trans-" in "translation" (the *über-* in *übersetzen*) does and does not mean: "'Translating' [*Übersetzen*] is not so much a '*trans*-lating' [Über-*setzen*] and passing over into a foreign language with the help of one's own. Rather, translation is more an awakening, clarification, and unfolding of one's own language with the help of the encounter with the foreign language" (GA53:81/65–66).

Heidegger's most extensive remarks on translation are found in the commentary to his translation of the Greek word *deinon* as "the unhomely" (*das Unheimliche*; see UNCANNINESS) in his 1943 interpretation of Sophocles' *Antigone* in *Hölderlin's Hymn "The Ister,"* and are further

taken up in the *Parmenides* lecture course the following semester. As informed by the "Letter to Böhlendorff," Heidegger rejects conventional theories of translation, which conceive it as the dictionary-driven substitution of one word for the equivalent word in another language – an approach Heidegger finds symptomatic of the technical relation to language and its reduction to communication. By contrast, Heidegger understands the necessity of translation to be situated by the unsaid dimension of a given language, whose "spirit" is literally articulated in the words and mode of expressivity of that language but which on its own remains inaccessible within it without the help of a foreign language. This has important hermeneutical implications that extend throughout Heidegger's philosophical corpus and lead him to connect translation to the act of interpretation in such a way that interpretation, in its address to the unsaid, is understood to constitute a translation *within* one's own language. In the *Ister* course Heidegger is explicit that his interpretation of Hölderlin – but also his interpretations of Kant and Hegel – is the translation of German into German. Indeed, what distinguishes a "great text" for Heidegger is its need of translation understood in this manner.

   The back-and-forth relation between "foreign" and "native" helps contextualize Heidegger's idiosyncrasy as a translator at the same time it reveals that there is something deeper at issue that concerns the essence of language rather than what is perceived as his willful rejection of philology. In addition to becoming more explicit about translation, Heidegger's translation "style" changes, starting with his translations of the pre-Socratics and Sophocles in *Introduction to Metaphysics*. While this is evident in Heidegger's rendering of *phusis* as "emerging-abiding PREVAILING" (*aufgehend-verweilende Walten*) rather than its conventional translation as "growth" or "arising," or in his version of *polemos* as "confrontational setting apart" (*Auseinander-setzung*; see CONFRONTATION) rather than simply "battle," it is made most vivid in the self-confessed violence of his translation of *deinon* with "the uncanny" (*das Unheimliche*). In this case, Heidegger's translation is intimately bound up with his interpretation of the meaning he ascribes to the word *deinon* in his reading of Sophocles' second choral ode; the translation is not intended to be philologically "correct" but interpretively performative in enacting the shattering of *techne* as a knowing seeing out beyond what is occurrent against the limit that situates its very possibility of its own intelligibility. Seen from the perspective of the "Letter to Böhlendorff," Heidegger's translation of German by way of the Greek takes place as an encounter with the "violence of being," which places the Germans' native "clarity of presentation" into its proper bounds through the corrective excess native to the Greek foreign in relation to their appropriation of what is native to the Germans. Here it is interesting to note that although Heidegger does not change his translation of *deinon* in the *Ister* course, he does importantly amend his interpretation of the *Antigone* (and Antigone) to bring forward the unsaid dimension of his own thought concerning the uncanniness or unhomeliness of the human being, in effect successively retranslating his early privileging of this term in *Being and Time* "into Heidegger" with the help of Hölderlin's translations of Sophocles.

Julia Ireland

209.
TRANSPARENCY (*DURCHSICHTIGKEIT*)

Transparency is a quality Heidegger attributes to certain interpretations. If an interpretation has transparency, this means the interpreter does not take the presuppositions structuring her interpretive point of view for granted, no matter how self-evident they seem; the interpreter actively maintains a readiness to revise or reject the presuppositions initially guiding her interpretation so that new possibilities for understanding can be revealed.

There are two senses of "transparency" operative in *Being and Time*: (1) a broad, methodological sense that can be used to assess the quality of any interpretation, such as interpretations of historical events or philosophical texts; (2) a narrow, existentiell sense that applies to the *self*-interpretation of an individual Dasein.

Heidegger employs the term in its broad, methodological sense beginning at the outset of *Being and Time* in §2, but when he comes explicitly to define "transparency" in §31 he does so in the narrow, existentiell sense. The German word for transparency, *Durchsichtigkeit*, is built on the stem word for "sight," *Sicht*, and literally means something like see-through-ableness. Presenting *Durchsichtigkeit* on analogy with the other *Sicht* terms (circumspection or *Umsicht* and considerateness or *Rücksicht*), Heidegger writes: "we choose this term to designate a 'knowledge of the self' [*Selbsterkenntnis*] in a sense which is well understood" (SZ 146).

By referring to a knowledge of the self in "a sense which is well understood," Heidegger evokes the Delphic injunction, "Know Thyself," *gnothi seauton*. He is also echoing a passage from Kierkegaard's *Either/Or* in which Judge William explains his version of transparency:

> The person who lives ethically has seen himself, knows himself, penetrates his whole concretion with consciousness.... He knows himself. The phrase *gnothi seauton* [know thyself] is a stock phrase, and in it has been perceived the goal of all a person's striving.[1]

Heidegger does not follow Judge William in seeing transparency as a kind of reflectively self-conscious introspective clarity. On the contrary, Heidegger immediately distances his notion of transparency from introspective clarity: "here it is not a matter of perceptually tracking down and inspecting a point called 'Self,' but rather of seizing upon [*ergreifen*] the full disclosedness of being-in-the-world, and doing so with understanding" (SZ 146).

To "seize upon the full disclosedness of being-in-the-world" as a means to self-knowledge is to cultivate a critical-hermeneutic sensitivity to the multifarious ways in which the individual identity of the self is always shaped by taken-for-granted social-historical prejudgments

---

[1] Kierkegaard 1987, 258. See the discussion in Han-Pile 2013, 299.

inherited from a shared tradition. In order to clarify this we need to outline the methodological sense of transparency.

The methodological sense of transparency pertains to the expansive application Heidegger makes of the hermeneutic notions of understanding and interpretation throughout *Being and Time*. Transparency in this methodological sense has to do with our responsiveness to and way of interpretively taking up ("seizing upon," *ergreifen*), rather than taking for granted, the limited, partial, and mutable, historically formed pre-judgments and presuppositions (*Voraussetzungen*, SZ 232) that guide all understanding and interpretation.

Our presuppositions tend to cover themselves up and sediment into a tradition that locks us into a narrowed-down "self-evident" understanding of what is normal, worthwhile, acceptable, and possible. Indeed, Heidegger systematically opposes "transparency" not to "opacity," but to "self-evidence" (*Selbstverständlichkeit*).

Heidegger thus says that in order properly to formulate the question of being as the fundamental question, "it must be made transparent" (SZ 5). Transparency is called for because the question of being, "something which the ancient philosophers found continually disturbing as something obscure and hidden has taken on a clarity and self-evidence [*sonnenklaren Selbstverständlichkeit*] such that if anyone continues to ask about it, he is charged with an error of method" (SZ 2). In other words, the question of being "has deteriorated to a tradition in which it gets reduced to something self-evident" (SZ 22).

Indeed, this is the general problem that Heidegger finds in blindly received traditions as such: "tradition takes what has come down to us and delivers it over to self-evidence" (SZ 21). Because of this self-evidence, Dasein "falls prey to the tradition of which it has more or less expressly taken hold [*ergriffenen*]. This tradition keeps it from providing its own guidance, whether in inquiring or in choosing" (SZ 21). Self-evident traditions, then, are the opposite of transparent: "if the question of being is to have its own history made transparent, then this hardened tradition must be loosened up" (SZ 22).

The methodological sense of transparency and its contrast to the pernicious self-evidence of tradition can be elucidated in connection with Heidegger's deployment of another term he lifts from Kierkegaard, REPETITION (*Wiederholung*). Repetition is Heidegger's name for the mode of interpreting that "loosens up" the narrowness and self-evidence of tradition. Roughly speaking, repeating is a way to be an *active receiver* and transmitter of a shared tradition as well as of an individual life history, where this involves, again, a readiness to call into question the presuppositions guiding and situating the interpretation. In the methodological terminology that Heidegger was developing in 1923–24: "the repetition is the REFLECTION [*Besinnung*] on the hermeneutical situation, on the position of the interpretation itself" (GA17:115). Such a mode of interpretation involves a "critique of the present, a critique such that, through it, the situation of the interpretation itself becomes transparent and critically tilled [*aufgelockert*]" (GA17:122; see SZ 397).

Heidegger employs the notion of repetition in several contexts: existentiell self-interpretation (SZ 385), fundamental ontology's inheritance of traditional ONTOLOGY (SZ 22; GA26:197), as well as authentic historiography (SZ §76). In each case, Heidegger connects repetition to transparency, and glosses the latter as the revelation of possibilities that had been covered up or distorted by the self-evident tradition.

The above reflections on the methodological sense of "transparency" underline how the narrow or existentiell sense of "transparency" refers to a form of self-knowledge that involves

a hermeneutic sensitivity to multifarious ways in which the commitments (or FOR-THE-SAKES-OF-WHICH) guiding our trajectory in life are always shaped by taken-for-granted prejudgments inherited from a shared tradition. Cultivating existentiell transparency means maintaining an openness to the possibility that even our most settled identities and resolutions may have to be "taken back" (SZ 308) or "given up" (SZ 391) in light of the demands of a particular situation.

B. Scot Rousse

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 5, 7, 22, 51, 122, 144, 146, 234, 299, 303, 307, 308, 324, 404; GA17:92, 110,122, 277, 279, 288

TRANSPORTING (*ÜBERSETZUNG*). SEE TRANSLATION.

210.
TRUTH (*WAHRHEIT*)

According to heidegger, the philosophical tradition, beginning with Plato and Aristotle, has misunderstood the essence of truth by conceiving of it as accuracy, correctness, or rightness (*Richtigkeit*), or more specifically as a kind of correspondence or agreement (*Übereinstimmung*) between one thing and another – a belief and a fact, a proposition and a state of affairs, more generally the mind and the world – an idea captured in Thomas Aquinas' famous thesis that *Veritas est adaequatio rei et intellectus* (in addition to *adaequatio*, Aquinas also sometimes used the words *conformitas* and *correspondentia*). Although these conceptions of truth have come to seem obvious, Heidegger believes that poets and thinkers did not always conceive of truth as correctness or correspondence, and moreover that a different, more fundamental notion of truth persists in our ordinary understanding of our relation to the world. In Archaic Greek poetry and pre-Socratic philosophy, Heidegger maintains, ἀλήθεια (see *Alêtheia*; the word standardly translated by *Wahrheit* in German and "truth" in English) meant revealedness, disclosedness, unconcealment (*Unverborgenheit*). Moreover, he argues, even today our concept of truth as correctness presupposes a more fundamental understanding of unconcealedness – namely, that in virtue of which anything at all can show up in the world either as being true or as being truly depicted or described.

Heidegger's critique of the traditional concept of truth is often misinterpreted in two ways. On the one hand, it is sometimes supposed that Heidegger dismisses the idea of correctness altogether, whereas in fact he maintains that the notion is a legitimate part of our ordinary notion of truth, one that neither can nor should be rejected or replaced. On the other hand, he is sometimes read merely as criticizing a rather refined, esoteric conceit of philosophers, namely the correspondence theory of truth, which arguably has its earliest expression in Aristotle. As we shall see, however, although Heidegger's critique is not hostile to the concept of correctness, neither is it merely a technical objection to the correspondence theory. Instead, he argues that the concept of truth underwent a fundamental change with the emergence of metaphysical thinking in classical antiquity, in the work of both Plato and Aristotle, and that our current understanding of truth remains something richer and deeper than the more readily familiar notions of correctness and correspondence. While in pre-classical Greece truth was understood as unconcealment, Heidegger maintains, for us the idea of correctness still makes sense only against the background of our normally tacit understanding of unconcealment.

In §44 of *Being and Time* Heidegger argues that the "ontological foundation" of the traditional concept of truth is a phenomenon he calls "uncovering" (*Entdecken*): an assertion can be true only if it is somehow involved in the uncovering of entities. Somewhat misleadingly, he advances this as a claim about what it *means* to say that an assertion is true: "the assertion *is true* means it uncovers the entity in itself [*an ihm selbst*]. It asserts, it indicates, it 'lets' the entity 'be seen' (ἀπόφανὰις) in its uncoveredness. The *being-true* (*truth*) of an assertion must be understood as *being-uncovering*" (SZ 218). This might make it sound as if Heidegger is

advancing a theory of truth, one that purports to analyze or reduce correctness to uncovering. Instead, he is making two distinct claims, one negative and one positive.

The negative claim is that truth *cannot* be understood as a kind of correspondence or approximation of one OCCURRENT (*vorhanden*) thing to another. Immediately following the sentences quoted above he continues, "Truth thus has by no means the structure of a correspondence between cognition and object in the sense of a likeness (*Angleichung*) of one entity (SUBJECT) to another (OBJECT)" (SZ 218–19). In the 1930 essay "On the Essence of Truth" Heidegger broadens his starting point to include not just the "propositional truth" (*Satzwahrheit*) of beliefs and assertions, but also the "material truth" (*Sachwahrheit*) of things, for example "true" gold as opposed to fool's gold. This kind of truth (or realness) has also traditionally been understood in terms of correspondence – in this case, not the correspondence of words to things, but of the concrete particular to the ideal essence it instantiates, or the standard or criterion it satisfies. Heidegger's positive claim is that uncovering is essential to truth: for an assertion or proposition to be true is for it to uncover an entity as it is "in itself"; for an entity to be true (or *real*) is for it to be so uncovered.[1]

Although Heidegger clearly denies that truth can be understood as a correspondence relation between two given things, scholars disagree about whether he accepts some other notion of correspondence as a benign aspect of our ordinary concept of truth. Whereas some suppose that his purpose is, as Barbara Fultner says, "to *replace* a correspondence conception of truth with a conception of truth as disclosure" (Fultner 2013), others have proposed instead that he embraces the idea of correspondence and seeks merely, as Heidegger himself puts it, "to lay bare the ontological foundations of that conception" (SZ 214). Mark Wrathall, for example, maintains that "Heidegger always saw propositional truth as being a specific kind of unconcealment, one that consists in correspondence with a fact or state of affairs."[2]

One way to resolve this disagreement is to recall that Heidegger directs his critique at two different concepts of truth, though he often runs them together. Call them the *ordinary* concept and the *traditional* concept. The ordinary concept is that of correctness (*Richtigkeit*): to be true is simply to be right (*richtig*) rather than wrong (*falsch*); this applies to assertions and beliefs, but also to experiences (true love, false sightings), actions (correct procedure, wrong turns), and objects (real diamonds, false teeth). The traditional concept, by contrast, is not the ordinary concept, but a *theory* that purports to analyze or explain that concept by further describing it as a kind of adequation, conformity, correspondence, or agreement (*Übereinstimmung*). Heidegger's argument can thus be broken down into two claims: (1) that unconcealment is the condition of the possibility of correctness, and (2) that unconcealment is what lends the idea of correspondence its apparent plausibility as a theory of correctness. But is it plausible? When Heidegger discusses the notion of correspondence, he insists that it adds nothing either illuminating or explanatory to the concept of correctness. In *Being and Time* he calls it "empty" (SZ 215), and in his lectures of 1931–32 he dismisses it as "utterly obscure," "ambiguous," and "unintelligible"

---

[1] Heidegger's "the entity in itself" (*das Seiende an ihm selbst*), uncovered by a true assertion, is not to be confused with the Kantian "thing in itself" (*Ding an sich*), which can never be given in experience.

[2] Wrathall 2011, 35. See also Wrathall 1999. For a more robust reading of Heidegger as embracing a correspondence theory, at least with respect to physical nature, see Dreyfus 2017a, 109–24.

(GA34:3, 4, 6).³ What Heidegger rejects, then, is not the concept of correctness, but the additional image or metaphor of correspondence, which purports to clarify that concept, but in fact merely obscures it.⁴

In addition to that negative claim, Heidegger argues positively that the truth of an assertion consists in its uncovering an entity, as it is "in itself." Uncovering as such cannot analyze our ordinary concept of truth, since false assertions also uncover entities, albeit not as they are "in themselves." In much of our ordinary experience, Heidegger says, "entities are not completely hidden, but precisely uncovered, but at the same time obscured [*verstellt*]; they show themselves – but in the mode of semblance [*Schein*]" (SZ 222). Earlier in *Being and Time* he defines "semblance" or mere "SEEMING" (*Schein*) as "what is [*Seiendes*] showing itself as what it is *not* in itself [*an ihm selbst*]" (SZ 28), and as "that which looks like, but 'in actuality' is not what it presents itself as" (SZ 29). In a word, semblance is *falseness*.

In the 1960s Ernst Tugendhat, who studied with Heidegger, advanced what is perhaps the most famous critique of Heidegger's account of truth by arguing that it rests on a fatal equivocation on precisely this point. Tugendhat takes it for granted that Heidegger is attempting to analyze or reduce truth to uncovering: "Heidegger handles propositional truth and comes to the conclusion that it must be understood as 'uncovering,'" and, like Husserl before him, offers "a comprehensive interpretation of the adequation formula."⁵ Since false assertions uncover entities no less than true ones do, however, his account must have recourse to that crucial qualifier "in themselves." But Heidegger has no positive account of that qualifier, so nothing he says distinguishes truth from falsity. What is essential to truth, Tugendhat insists, is precisely its normative distinction from falsity, a distinction the notion of uncovering cannot draw. Tugendhat concludes that Heidegger has not advanced beyond what philosophers like Aristotle and Husserl had already said about truth, and moreover that what is original in his account amounts to an abdication of the concept: "truth, for Husserl as well as for Greek philosophy, in no way resided in givenness as such but in the possibility of a distinctive mode of givenness. . . . If the meaning of unconcealment were exhausted in this, that it lifted the entity out of concealment into the light, then we would have no occasion to talk about truth and untruth."⁶

But is Tugendhat right that the point of Heidegger's account is to analyze or reduce truth to unconcealment? Some scholars, while granting Tugendhat's point about the crucial normative contrast between true and false, have regarded the glaring obviousness of his objection as reason to believe that he misunderstood the intention and substance of Heidegger's claim.⁷ Since Heidegger himself says explicitly that semblance is a kind of uncovering, he cannot very well have supposed that uncovering is what distinguishes the true from the false. It is more plausible to read him as arguing that uncovering is essential to truth as a necessary, but not a sufficient condition. Truth presupposes uncovering, but so does falsity. Why? Because even the idea of a false assertion presupposes some notion of that *about which* or *with respect to which* the assertion is false, which is to say, something uncovered or uncoverable as *other than* what the assertion says of it.

Consistent with this is the fact that Heidegger explicitly says his "definition" of truth is not meant to refute or supplant either (what I have called) the ordinary or the traditional concept:

---

³ Wrathall suggests that Heidegger says merely that the correspondence conception of truth is "misunderstood" (*unverstanden*). But Heidegger says *unverstanden* and *unverständlich* in the same breath and does not use the word *missverstanden*. In German, as in English, to say that something *is not* understood does not imply that it *can be*.

⁴ For further elaboration of this point, see Carman 2015.   ⁵ Tugendhat 1996, 230.   ⁶ *Ibid.*, 234.

⁷ For a compelling critique of Tugendhat's critique, see Wrathall 1999.

the proposed "definition" of truth is not a *shaking off* of the tradition, but a primordial *appropriation* of it; all the more so if it can be demonstrated that and how theory had to arrive at the idea of correspondence on the basis of the primordial phenomenon of truth. (SZ 220)

What that says is not that philosophical theory *had to* arrive at the idea of correspondence, but that, given that it did, it could have done so only *on the basis of* the primordial phenomenon, namely uncovering. Moreover, of the Greek word ἀλήθεια he says, "to translate this word as 'truth,' and above all to define this expression conceptually in theoretical ways, is to cover up" its original meaning (SZ 219). That is, not only is ἀλήθεια not what we mean by the word "truth"; it isn't even a notion that could figure in a theory of (our concept of) truth. This is why in the next few pages of the text Heidegger refers to his own "definition" of truth in scare quotes; whatever else his claim may be, it is neither an analysis of truth nor a definition of the word (our word) "truth."

Even more fundamental than his account of uncovering, understood as a necessary condition of both true and false assertion, is Heidegger's effort in §44 of *Being and Time* to trace truth back to the ontological structure of being-in-the-world, or what he calls Dasein's "DISCLOSEDNESS" (*Erschlossenheit*). Being-true means being-uncovering, so to say that an assertion is true is (at least in part) to say that it uncovers entities. But assertions uncover entities only because *people* do; it is, after all, people who make assertions. This is why Heidegger takes the concrete speech act of assertion (*Aussage*) rather than the abstract sentence or proposition (*Satz*) as his point of departure. Assertion is a kind of understanding (*Verstehen*), hence a form of "comportment" (*Verhalten*): "Asserting is a [way of] being toward the existing thing itself" (SZ 218). Moreover, in its various modes of comportment, Dasein uncovers entities in a wide variety of ways, most of which have nothing to do with making assertions, or using language generally, or even entertaining beliefs: we uncover objects by perceiving them; we uncover tools by using them; we uncover other people in mutual recognition, cooperative action, and common knowledge. Being-uncovering is thus a possibility for assertions only because it is a possibility for human beings, who uncover entities only because they disclose worlds: "being-true as being-uncovering is … ontologically possible only on the basis of BEING-IN-THE-WORLD. This phenomenon, which we have identified as a fundamental state of Dasein, is the *foundation* of the primordial phenomenon of truth" (SZ 219). Heidegger therefore maintains that there is a kind of "truth" in Dasein's disclosing of a world in which entities can in turn be uncovered:

being-true as being-uncovering is a mode of Dasein's being. What makes this uncovering itself possible must necessarily be called "true" in a still more primordial sense. … Uncovering is a mode of being of being-in-the-world. … What is primarily "true" – that is, uncovering – is Dasein. … [O]nly with the *disclosedness* of Dasein is the *most primordial* phenomenon of truth attained. (SZ 220)

Just by existing in the ontologically distinctive way that it does, "*Dasein* is 'in the truth'" (SZ 221).

Heidegger maintains furthermore that "*all truth is … relative to the being of Dasein*" (SZ 227); that "'*there is*' truth only insofar and as long as Dasein is" (SZ 226). Such formulations might sound like an extreme form of idealism or relativism, according to which what and how entities actually are is dependent on human beings, on whatever our opinions, beliefs, and scientific theories

happen to be. But Heidegger draws a sharp distinction between entities on the one hand, and the truths that uncover them on the other, that is, the experiences, beliefs, and theories through which they are accessible to us. For example, Heidegger writes, "before Newton's laws were discovered, they were not 'true'; from that it does not follow that they were false, nor that they would become false if no discoveredness were any longer possible ontically" (SZ 226). That is, the way the physical world actually is depends neither on Newton nor on the laws he formulated:

> to say that before Newton his laws were neither true nor false cannot mean that beforehand there were no such entities as were uncovered and pointed out by them. The laws became true through Newton; with them entities in themselves became accessible for Dasein. With uncoveredness, entities show themselves precisely as entities that already were beforehand. Such uncovering is "truth's" kind of being. (SZ 227)

To say that truth is "relative to Dasein," then, is not to say that the way things are depends on us and our beliefs; rather, it means that truth is not intrinsic to entities, but is the way in which they are accessible to us, just as visibility is not an intrinsic property of things, but is the way in which they can be seen.

Some critics have worried that reading Heidegger's claim in this deflationary way threatens to reduce it to the thesis that, as Denis McManus puts it, "no truths are *expressed* or *entertained* without the existence of Dasein," which is trivial (McManus 2012, 181). McManus, however, sees no other way in which the claim can be construed as plausible, and his approach is instead (in the spirit of the later Wittgenstein) to diagnose Heidegger's succumbing to the temptation to assert it as symptomatic of a kind of philosophical confusion. One might reply that drawing a sharp distinction between entities and the truths about them allows Heidegger to say something weaker than the relativist conceit that the way the world is depends on our assertions and beliefs about it, but stronger than tautologies such as that asserted truths must be asserted by someone, true beliefs held by someone, and so on. What the distinction points up instead is that truth is not a property of objects, but an aspect of intelligibility, and that the intelligibility of entities is fundamentally different from any of their OCCURRENT structures or features, which are nevertheless what true assertions and beliefs are true *of*. Heidegger, one might say, is a realist not about truth, but about the entities *of which* (at least some) truths are true. As he says in his Aristotle lectures of 1931,

> the independence of occurrent things from us human beings is untouched by the fact that even this independence as such is possible only if human beings exist. The being-in-itself of things becomes not only inexplicable, but utterly meaningless without the existence of human beings; which doesn't mean that the things themselves are dependent on human beings. (GA33:202)

Or, as he puts it in *Basic Problems*, the lecture course of 1927, "For nature to be as it is, it does not need truth, i.e. unveiledness [*Enthülltheit*]" (GA24:315).

A problem remains. Even if Tugendhat was wrong to suppose that Heidegger was trying to define or analyze correctness as uncoveredness, his critique raises an awkward question for Heidegger's account, namely, why *call* uncoveredness, unconcealment, and disclosedness – which, as we have seen, are necessary but not sufficient conditions of correctness – "*truth*"?

Why use the same word to refer to the phenomenon that normally goes by that name *and* to the transcendental condition of its intelligibility? If unconcealment is merely an indifferent condition of both truth and falsity, then calling it "truth" is at best misleading. If, however, there is a kind of unconcealment involved in truth that distinguishes it from falsity, then we need to say how it differs from the contrasting kind of unconcealment that characterizes incorrectness, illusion, semblance, dissembling, and fakery.

One possible solution to this problem lies in the structural asymmetry of first and third person points of view. It is not that false beliefs and assertions cannot be said to uncover entities, but neither is unconcealment an entirely neutral condition of both truth and falsity, with no special relation to the true in contrast to the false. It is rather that, as G.E. Moore observed, *we* cannot regard *our own* beliefs – that is, the beliefs that disclose things to us by our *having* them – as false. What makes it even possible to *regard* a belief as true is the *having* of the belief, just as what makes it possible to regard assertions as true is the actual practice of assertion-making. So, for example, although we can admit that Ptolemaic astronomy, though false, can be said to have revealed the earth as motionless to ancient and medieval scientists, we cannot regard their beliefs as disclosing it as motionless *to us*. False beliefs, precisely by being false, far from uncovering entities "in themselves," must strike us instead as obstacles and barriers to those entities, distorting and concealing them. The observations, illustrations, attitudes, propositions, and theories that *we* can regard as revealing things *to us* are just those that we accept as *true*.[8]

Taylor Carman

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Truth was one of the most important themes in Heidegger's thought, particularly from the mid-1920s to the mid-1940s. During those two decades, both in his lectures and in his published works, he returned again and again to questions concerning truth, its essence, its meaning, and the conditions of its intelligibility. His 1925 lecture course was called *Logik: Die Frage nach der Wahrheit* (*Logic: The Question of Truth*, GA21), and in both 1930–31 and 1933–34 he lectured under the title *Vom Wesen der Wahrheit* (*On the Essence of Truth*); "Vom Wesen der Wahrheit" is also the title of an essay first delivered as a lecture in 1930 and then published in 1943 (in GA9). Apart from *Being and Time*, main sources for Heidegger's reflections on truth include the lecture courses *Einleitung in die Philosophie* (*Introduction to Philosophy*, GA27, 1928–29), *Grundfragen der Philosophie* (*Basic Questions of Philosophy*, GA45, 1937–38), *Nietzsches Lehre vom Willen zur Macht als Erkenntnis* (*Nietzsche's Doctrine of the Will to Power as Knowledge*, GA47, 1939), and *Parmenides* (GA54, 1942–43); the essays "Was ist Metaphysik?" ("What Is Metaphysics?" GA9, 1929), "Der Ursprung des Kunstwerkes" ("The Origin of the Work of Art," GA5, 1935–36), and "Platons Lehre von der Wahrheit" ("Plato's Doctrine of Truth," GA9, 1940); and the posthumously published works of the late 1930s and early 1940s, *Beiträge zur Philosophie* (*Contributions to Philosophy*, GA65), *Besinnung* (*Reflection*, GA66), and *Das Ereignis* (GA71).

---

[8] See Carman 2015. This approach is consistent, incidentally, with appreciating, even cherishing, false descriptions for the ways in which they, too, reveal entities, albeit *not* as they are in themselves. Hyperbole and caricature, for instance, cast a kind of light on things precisely by being inaccurate and getting them wrong in interesting ways.

211.
TURN (*KEHRE*)

"Turn" can refer to: (1) a reversal of perspective, turning from Dasein's being to being itself; (2) a transformation in Heidegger's style and approach to philosophy; or (3) a fundamental change in being's relation to us, leading to a new INCEPTION that overcomes metaphysics.

In its first meaning, the turn refers to the turn-around that was to have taken place in the Division III of Part One of *Being and Time*, "time and being," where, he later says, "here, everything is reversed" (GA9:328/BW 231; see also SZ 39, HR 302). This Division reverses the book's title, indicating a significant shift in perspective. As this Division was never published (he says that he wrote it but, dissatisfied, destroyed it),[1] we can only speculate as to what it would have said.[2] Heidegger insists that this Division would not have marked an abandonment or repudiation of the first two, but rather their proper fulfillment. In particular, it would have dispelled the impression that the published portion made on some readers (such as Husserl) that Heidegger was solely or primarily concerned with the nature of DASEIN. This Division would have shown that the book was really about what it says it's about – the question of BEING – and that the long analysis of Dasein's existence in the first two Divisions is entirely in the service of this question. It would have turned from Dasein's being to being itself, although Dasein wouldn't have simply dropped out of the picture. Heidegger frequently claims that all discussions of being are also discussions of us, and vice versa (see GA9:407–09/308–09; BW 235; ID 31; GA45:211–12/212; Braver 2007, 275–79).

"The turn" or "the turning" has also accrued the meaning of a change that took place in Heidegger's writing and thinking sometime after the publication of *Being and Time*. Now Heidegger sometimes rejects this sense, insisting that the *Kehre* actually means a turning that takes place in being itself rather than in his career (e.g., HR 302). Regardless of how he uses the word, however, it has come to have this meaning in the secondary literature so I think this use legitimate, as long as we're clear about which sense we're using.

Scholars disagree about the precise timing, nature, extent, and even existence of this turn in his work, but talk of an early Heidegger and a late one remains fairly standard. Heidegger himself wrote of Heidegger I and II, with the caveat that each could only be understood via the other (HR 304). This turn does not necessarily mean that he came to disagree with his earlier views – although I think that he did change his mind on some important issues – but he certainly changed the way he approached the topics. His writing becomes more poetic after the early 1930s, more allusive, dropping whatever trappings of traditional, professional philosophizing that still remained in *Being and Time*. Dasein or man gets downplayed (though never left out) in favor of being itself, and HISTORY plays a much more significant role. Heidegger sometimes

---

[1] GA66:413–14; GA14:99–100/TB 80; Safranski 1998, 143, 171; Kisiel 1993, 477–89. A lecture bearing the title "Time and Being" was given in 1962 (GA14:3–30/TB 1–24), but it cannot be taken to be what Heidegger would have written in 1927.

[2] For the views of a number of leading Heidegger scholars on this question, see Braver 2015.

denies that there was any significant alteration in his thought, though usually with what I find strained reinterpretations of his earlier work that force it onto the Procrustean bed of his contemporary views.

We also need to be wary of focusing too much on the standard period of the turning – somewhere in the late 1920s to the early 1930s. Heidegger continued changing his views and the ways he presented them throughout his long career, with each decade turning up new key words, thinkers to focus on, and strategies to express the ever-elusive topic of his thought. This is in keeping with his view of thinking as temporal and historical. Living thought is continuously evolving, opening up new paths as it wanders through unknown territory; I take it that this is why he chose as the motto for his collected writings: "ways, not works." Thus it is not entirely correct to speak of a later Heidegger, but rather later Heideggers.

Although "the turn" has acquired the meaning of a turn in Heidegger's work, we need to take seriously his claim that it refers to something that takes place with being. Indeed, one of the persistent ideas throughout his later work is that THINKING is necessarily a response, so any alteration in his thinking presupposes that something calls upon him to think differently.

The most basic turning here is being's turning away from us (see ABANDONMENT OF BEING and FORGETFULNESS OF BEING). It is one of the most fundamental views of Heidegger's work from beginning to end that being is deeply elusive or, as he translates Heraclitus, being loves to hide. While we are engaged with particular entities, we hardly ever think about their nature or way of being or BEINGNESS – what it is that makes them the kind of entity they are. Even less do we attend to the mere fact that they are at all: "the simple *factum est* … that such a work *is* rather than is not … disappears in usefulness. The more handy a piece of equipment is, the more inconspicuous it remains that, for example, this particular hammer is" (GA5:52–53/BW 190). Being withdraws, and yet these aspects cannot be wholly absent – if we did not recognize the car or pen as existing and in the mode of equipmentality, we would not be able to engage with them appropriately. This is what *Being and Time* means in claiming that all interactions with entities take place on the basis of a pre-ontological or implicit understanding of their being.

This withdrawal is not a contingent fact that could be otherwise but is rather the very nature of being. In order to let entities encounter us, their beingness and being *must* recede from our explicit attention. Driving a car while focusing on the fact that it is would hardly be conducive to driving, which happens best when we think about it the least; were we prone to do this, bans on Driving While Ontologizing might join laws forbidding intoxication and texting.[3] Being turns away from us not *in addition* to letting entities appear but *in the very act* of letting them appear. "If we stand in a clearing in the woods, we see only what can be found within it: the free place, the trees about – and precisely not the luminosity of the clearing itself" (GA45:211/210–11; see also GA45:147–48/146–48). Being turns away *in* turning out entities, and we naturally turn away from being and their beingness in turning toward the entities that concern us. It's not just that every UNCON-CEALMENT carries with it an underside not presently revealed; unconcealment conceals the very fact of unconcealing by pointing us toward the unconcealed things. This is not a

---

[3] Hubert Dreyfus discusses this division between skill and attention at length, bringing it to bear on the issue of AI. See Dreyfus 1991, and Dreyfus 1992; see also my Braver 2012, esp. chap. 4.

separate phase, but rather the very structure of that most basic fact of all – that being is or, to emphasize how dynamically this transpires, that be-ing happens.

Heidegger believes that this original event is what drives the entire history of philosophy. Each great metaphysician has her own way of putting beingness into words by saying what it is that makes entities real at that time – not changing, changing, participation in Forms, being a particular individual, divine creation, being a quantitatively measurable substance, organized by the mind, self-evolved in history, or temporary coagulation of will to POWER. Just as engaging with entities hides or covers over their beingness – using the pen to write draws us away from thinking about its penness or equipmentality – so focusing on beingness causes their mere being to withdraw. Heidegger started with a two-part ontological difference, but his later work operates with a three-level ontology where each level covers over the next. Dealing with entities covers over (while presupposing) their beingness; examining their beingness or essential qualities blocks us from considering (while presupposing) their bare manifestation. While he continuously studies the history of philosophy, he is looking for something that is not explicitly contained there, philosophy's unsaid. Within these perpetually recurring withdrawals, being leaves signs of its withdrawal, indicating the direction to look if we turn the thought around to follow its emergence back toward its source.

To turn toward being we must turn away from metaphysics because metaphysics trains our focus on the wrong aspects. But – and this is a key insight of Heidegger's later work that will heavily influence Derrida – turning the page on the history of philosophy is much trickier than most believe; turning away is not simply turning off. Indeed, the recurrent proclamations of the end of metaphysics have themselves kept it going, reaching its culmination with Nietzsche's overturning (*Umkehrung*) of the birth of metaphysics in Plato's work. Plato split reality into the really real (*ontos on*) – unchanging, intellectual Forms – and the only partially real (*mē on*) – the changing, empirical, physical things of our everyday world. Nietzsche simply turns Plato's distinction around, making the changing, physical things real and the abstract meta-physical entities mere wisps of imaginary smoke. Heidegger considers this a momentous event in the history of metaphysics, but still precisely that – an event *within* the history of metaphysics. Nietzsche has overturned Plato's inaugural division, turning it upside down without turning down the task of metaphysics as dividing up the real and the unreal. Nietzsche's overturning (*Umkehrung*) is a mere reversal (*Verkehrung*), a turning around that re-turns to metaphysics rather than twisting free of it, although it may turn out to be the final turn that can end the game.

Nietzsche's reversal closes off metaphysics by ringing the last permutation on its defining division between real and apparent. This clears the way to turn off the path that philosophy has followed since Plato, happily just in time for Heidegger's turning up (funny how that works). If we can turn away from those activities that turn us away from being, then perhaps being can turn toward us as we turn toward it, turning the danger into the saving power. "When, in the turning of the danger, the truth of being flashes, the essence of being clears and lights itself up" (GA11:120/QCT 44). Heidegger sometimes refers to this as the other INCEPTION – a new alternative to Plato's first inception – or the return of the gods. Of course, we cannot turn ourselves toward being of our own accord or make being turn to us; such attempts to force being toward us drive it further away, constituting a perversion (another sense of *Verkehrung*) of our relationship. Attempts to turn being toward us turn it away. It is being's turn to turn toward us; all we can do for our turn is prepare the way, looking for signs

that it is beginning and nurturing conducive thoughts and practices. But it is essential for us to realize that we are not in control of the process if we are to get clear of the technological attitude of contemporary metaphysics. We must re-turn to the history of metaphysics over and over again, looking for hints to turn up as we turn over the soil, waiting for being to over-turn the centuries-long rule of metaphysics.

Lee Braver

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

BW 231, 235–37; SZ 39; HR 302; GA9:408–09/308–09; ID 31; GA45:211–12/179; GA66:413–14; TB 9, 29, 32, 80; N4 141; GA15:334–35/40–41; GA8:155/151; GA65:48, 176, 295

U

212.
UNCANNINESS (*UNHEIMLICHKEIT*)

Uncanniness is *how one is* in the fundamental DISPOSEDNESS of ANXIETY (SZ) and later "the basic trait of the human ESSENCE" (GA40:160/168). In *Being and Time*, it appears to be an unsettled feeling produced by a breakdown in familiarity, while in later lecture courses "uncanniness" usually names a presencing that occurs by way of an absencing. (Even when Heidegger uses "uncanniness," *Unheimlichkeit*, or "uncanny," *unheimlich*, in a seemingly non-technical way to describe MODERNITY or TECHNOLOGY, he is often drawing our attention to an important absencing or concealing.) On Heidegger's interpretation, it is to think the human being as uncannily presencing by means of absencing that Sophocles described the human being as the most *deinon* entity in the first choral ode in his *Antigone*. Through this, Sophocles founds Greek (and so Western) DASEIN as essentially uncanny: as presencing by means of an absencing.

Translating *Unheimlichkeit* as "uncanniness" captures the sense of the German term insofar as it names an eeriness or strangeness. But it does obscure the important element of the *heim* (home), from which *unheimliche* Dasein is excluded. In GA53, Heidegger introduces the closely related *Unheimische* (unhomely) as a further interpretation of the *Unheimliche* (uncanny), and here as elsewhere he draws attention to the *heim* by hyphenating: *Un-heimische*, *Un-heimliche*, *Un-heimlichkeit*. The hyphen also draws attention to the fact that what is *unheimlich* is excluded (*un-*) from the home or homely. To understand uncanniness, we must identify both the home from which Dasein is excluded and the nature of its exclusion.

Heidegger uses the adjective "uncanny" (*unheimlich*) in GA20, GA64, SZ and "What is Metaphysics?" (GA9) to describe *how one is* in anxiety: "In anxiety one is 'uncanny'" (SZ 188). Angst is some sort of breakdown in familiarity in which "one no longer is at home in [one's] most familiar environment" (GA20:400). Most interpreters take the homely to be the familiar and uncanniness to be a feeling of unfamiliarity or strangeness. Uncanny Dasein is outside the familiar; it is "not-being-at-home" (SZ 188). Since familiarity can always break down, "this uncanniness pursues Dasein constantly, and is a threat to its everyday lostness in the 'ANYONE'" (SZ 189).

But Heidegger also says that "from an existential-ontological point of view, the 'not-at-home' must be conceived as the more primordial phenomenon" (SZ 189, original italicized) – more primordial, that is, than everyday familiarity. This suggests that Dasein's uncanniness is not a passing feeling but a feature of it that underlies and makes possible the ordinary and the familiar, which is thus "a mode of Dasein's uncanniness" (SZ 189) rather than the reverse. Uncanniness is also said to belong to THROWNNESS and to lie at the ground of FALLING (SZ 189), although Heidegger does not make clear how or why this is so.

Already in GA17 (1923), Heidegger had described uncanniness as the ground of LANGUAGE and as "the condition of the possibility that something like *uncoveredness* lies in Dasein" (SZ 17; GA17:317). He returns to uncanniness as "the basic trait of the human essence" (GA40:160/168) or the "essential trait of human beings" (GA53:89) in GA40 and GA53 when he interprets

the first choral ode from Sophocles' *Antigone*, the so-called "Ode to Man." Heidegger uses *unheimlich* to translate Sophocles' *deinos* (usually: terrible, wonderful, strange), rendering the first line of the ode: "Manifold is the uncanny, yet nothing uncannier than the human being bestirs itself, rising up beyond him" (*Vielfältig das Unheimliche, nichts doch / über den Menschen hinaus Unheimlicheres ragend sich regt*, GA40:155/163). He insists that the uncanny is not to be understood as an emotion or feeling (GA40:160/168), and he instead identifies uncanniness with unconcealment (GA40:176/186). To be uncanny is to be unconcealing.

In GA53, Heidegger elaborates on the essence of uncanniness. It is "presencing in the manner of an absencing, and in such a way that whatever presences and absences here is itself simultaneously the OPEN realm of all presencing and absencing" (GA53:92). Thus, to say that the human being is uncanny is to say that it comes to presence as the entity that it is (namely, the site in which being as ALÊTHEIA occurs) only by way of a concealing of its own being from it. Dasein presences – and so unconcealing occurs – only in a simultaneous self-concealing. Since being is also unconcealing or presencing by way of a simultaneous concealing, being is also uncanny or *deinon* (GA40:169/179; GA10:96/65).

Such being uncanny is not mere "not being within the homely, a mere departing and breaking free from the homely" (GA53:89). Rather, it is a counter-turning (*Gegenwendigkeit*). The departure from the homely (absencing) turns counter to itself and becomes a way of seeking and attaining the homely (presencing). Thus the *Un-* of *Unheimlichkeit* does not simply negate, but in excluding also includes. The *heim* is here the ESSENCE, the own, or the proper rather than the familiar everyday.

Heidegger's concern with the way in which the *Un-* of *Unheimlichkeit* negates recalls Freud's own interest in this in his 1919 essay, "Das Unheimliche," or "The Uncanny" (although Heidegger does not seem to have been aware of Freud's essay). Freud follows Schelling in taking as uncanny that which "ought to have remained secret and hidden but has come to light" (Freud 2001, 225). Discussions of Freud's concept of uncanniness frequently associate or identify it with Heidegger's concept, although what relationship (if any) the two bear is a difficult interpretive question.

Heidegger finds two other counter-turning, and so uncanny, moments in Sophocles' description of the human being in the ode. The human being is described as "everywhere trying out, underway [*pantoporos*]; untried, with no way out [*aporos*]" (GA40:156/164; cf. GA53:73) and "rising high over the site [*hupsipolis*], losing the site [*apolis*]" (GA40:157/164; cf. GA53:73). In both descriptions, we see the same counter-turning structure: a positive moment (*pantoporos*, *hupsipolis*) turns counter to itself by including a negative moment (*aporos*, *apolis*).

Heidegger goes beyond the choral ode in GA53 to describe Sophocles' Antigone as "the supreme uncanny" (GA53:129). Antigone is "within the unhomely [*Unheimischen*] in a way that exceeds every other being unhomely" (GA53:128). This is because (on Heidegger's reading of Sophocles' Greek), Antigone takes up the *deinon* into her essence (GA53:127). Here we see the uncanny counter-turning again: such supreme uncanniness or unhomeliness turns counter to itself, making Antigone simultaneously the closest to the homely (GA53:129). Antigone is closest to the home precisely in being farthest from it. The home is here the hearth mentioned at the close of the ode (GA53:130, 133, 144), which in turn is understood as being (GA53:136, 140, 143, 147, 150).

Similarly, a PEOPLE can become homely in their own being or essence only if they depart from it by passing through the foreign. Using Hölderlin's terms, Heidegger claims that for the

Greeks what is foreign is the Germanic "clarity of presentation," while what is foreign to the Germans is the Greek "fire from the heavens" (GA53:155). It is in Hölderlin's and Sophocles' poetry, respectively, that the German and Greek people pass through the foreign and so first come to be homely in what is their own. Although the vocabulary is different, we see here again the counter-turning structure of uncanniness, in which a presencing occurs by way of an absencing.

Katherine Withy

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ §40; "What is Metaphysics?" in GA9; GA17:Supplement 30; GA20:§30b–c; GA40:§§52–53; GA53

213.

UNCONCEALMENT (*UNVERBORGENHEIT*)

"UNCONCEALMENT" IS HEIDEGGER's preferred (and rather literal) rendering of the Greek ἀλήθεια (ALÊTHEIA), which is usually translated as "TRUTH." Heidegger maintains that both our ordinary notion of truth as rightness or correctness (*Richtigkeit*) and the traditional conception of truth as agreement or correspondence (*Übereinstimmung*) presuppose what he believes the Archaic Greek poets and pre-Socratic thinkers understood by ἀλήθεια, namely, the uncovering of entities, the DISCLOSEDNESS of DASEIN, and the unconcealment of BEING (*Sein*).

Although by the 1960s Heidegger acknowledged that Latin and modern European words for *true – verum, vrai, wahr –* had narrower scope than the Greek term, his earlier practice had been to use ἀλήθεια, *Wahrheit*, and *Unverborgenheit –* along with other similar German words, such as *Entborgenheit* (a Heideggerian neologism that means something like "unhiddenness"), *Enthülltheit* (revealedness), *Unverdecktheit* (uncoveredness) – all more or less interchangeably. This could be misleading, however. For example, it might suggest that he was offering the concept of unconcealment as an analysis or definition of our ordinary concept of truth (usually conceived as something like correctness or correspondence with facts or states of affairs). But this was not the case, as Heidegger made clear in his 1931 lecture course, *Vom Wesen der Wahrheit*: "the meaning of the Greek word for truth, unconcealment, above all has absolutely nothing to do with assertion and with the factual context, set out in the customary definition of the essence of truth: with correspondence and correctness" (GA34:11). Similarly, in the 1960 essay, "Hegel and the Greeks," he writes, "if the essence of truth that straightaway comes to reign as correctness and certainty can subsist only within the realm of unconcealment, then truth indeed has to do with ἀλήθεια, but not ἀλήθεια with truth" (GA9:442/335). Heidegger's warnings notwithstanding, it is perhaps understandable that readers often confuse unconcealment with what we ordinarily think of as truth. In any event, in response to criticisms from Paul Friedländer and Ernst Tugendhat, Heidegger eventually disavowed the practice of calling unconcealment "truth" (GA14:76).

More important than changes in Heidegger's use of the word "truth," but less remarked upon, are changes in his use of the word "unconcealment." Before 1928, he never spoke of the "unconcealment of *being*" (*Sein*), nor did he associate unconcealment with what he had already been calling the "CLEARING" (*Lichtung*). In *Being and Time* he refers just once to unconcealment, and there he equates it with uncoveredness (*Entdecktheit*), which pertains to entities (*Seiende*). Only beginning with the 1928 lecture course *Einleitung in die Philosophie* did he distinguish between unconcealment and uncoveredness (see GA27:202–03). Not coincidentally, this was also around the same time he introduced the phrase "ontological DIFFERENCE" to mark the distinction between being and entities (GA24:22 and *passim*). Between 1928 and 1948, however, he referred both to the unconcealment of *being* and to the unconcealment of *entities*, though he himself later criticized that conflation in marginal notes (see GA9:132–33/103; GA5:60/45, 69/52). The self-criticism is probably a result of the fact that, by 1948, he came to believe that the

metaphysical tradition had only ever understood unconcealment as the unconcealment of entities, so that an important step in overcoming that tradition would consist precisely in thinking the unconcealment of being "as such" (see GA67:234). In any event, after about 1948, Heidegger rarely speaks of the unconcealment of *entities*; instead, from that point on, the term "unconcealment" occurs almost exclusively with regard to being and the clearing.

What does it mean to say that various kinds of things either contribute to or are brought into unconcealment – ASSERTIONS, objects, human existence, understandings of being, the clearing itself? The term "*un*concealment" is pertinent to all of these owing precisely to the *privative* character of the phenomenon in question. A "privative" phenomenon is one that can be understood and specified only in relation to what it is not. So, for example, incompleteness is intelligible only in relation to completeness, immortality only in relation to mortality, and so on. Privative concepts, however, are not always marked by privative prefixes such as *un-*, *in-*, *de-*, or *dis-*. To use one of Heidegger's own examples, reticence (*Verschwiegenheit*) is a privative phenomenon: to be reticent is not just not to speak (doorknobs don't speak), but to withhold speech or to refrain from speaking. Likewise, a stone is without sight, but it isn't blind. To be blind is to be deprived of sight. Nietzsche's distinctions between good and bad (*schlecht*) and good and evil (*böse*) provide two more illuminating examples: whereas the ancient Greeks and Romans understood the *bad* as defined by its lacking various positive qualities of goodness (excellence, strength, nobility, privilege), Christian morality construed the *good* privatively as the avoidance or elimination of what it deemed evil (lust, cruelty, egoism, pride) (Nietzsche 1996, First Essay, §13).

Privations, then, are not mere absences. Heidegger's notion of unconcealment applies to phenomena that are privative in this sense, and he thinks the alpha-privative form of the word ἀλήθεια shows that the Greeks were aware of the privative nature of truth, not only the "propositional truth" of beliefs and assertions, but also the "material truth" (or realness) of things (think of true gold or false teeth). "The awakening and forming of the word ἀλήθεια," he writes, "is not a mere accident" (GA34:127). Unconcealment can be understood only in relation to the kind of concealment or hiddenness that manifests itself and prevails in what is unconcealed. Concealment is the positive phenomenon we must first get clear about before we can understand what unconcealment amounts to.

What, then, is *concealment* with respect to propositional truth? Simply put, it is the unavailability of the world to a specific kind of human comportment, namely *thought*. So construed, however, propositional truth is just one form of a more general kind of unconcealment, namely the accessibilities of entities to *any* kind of human attitude or comportment. As we have seen, the unconcealment of entities is what Heidegger calls their "uncoveredness"; an entity is concealed in the proper sense when I cannot comport myself to it at all. The opposite of uncoveredness, Heidegger therefore says, "is not covering up, but rather lack of access for simple intending" (GA21:179). The unconcealment of entities, then, is the privation of a state of affairs in which something is unavailable for comportment. It includes all the different ways in which things are accessible to us, but the primary mode of comportment to focus on, Heidegger maintains, is our skillful managing of things and our ability to find our way around in a practical environment defined by tools, tasks, goals, and a wider horizon of meanings and purposes. This kind of practical competence does not obviously depend on our linguistic capacities, though language might well augment our other skills in various ways. Heidegger writes:

> The predominant comportment through which in general we uncover intraworldly entities is the utilization, the use of commonly used objects (*Gebrauchsdingen*): dealing with vehicles, sewing kits, writing equipment, work tools in order to . . ., equipment in the widest sense. In dealing with equipment we learn to know this first. It is not that we have beforehand a knowledge of these things in order then to put them to use, but rather the other way around. . . . The everyday dealing with intraworldly entities is the primary mode – and for many often the only mode – of uncovering the world. This dealing with intraworldly entities comports itself – as utilization, use, managing, producing, and so forth – toward equipment and the context of equipment ... we make use of it in a "self-evident manner." (GA25:21–22)

Heidegger believes it is constitutive of our human mode of being – namely, Dasein's BEING-IN-THE-WORLD – that we always already encounter ourselves in the midst of a world that is uncovered for us in this practical way.

This phenomenology of everyday practical comportment might seem to be in tension with the idea that the state of being covered up ought to take precedence in the way we make sense of our ordinary dealings with things in the world. Nevertheless, Heidegger is emphatic about the primacy of concealment: "when Dasein comes to existence, entities within the range of its existence are already familiar, manifest. With it a certain concealedness has also already occurred with it" (GA28:360). Every uncoveredness of the world, that is, occurs together with a concealing of entities, and Heidegger insists that the "default" state of entities is precisely to be hidden or covered up. He even has a slogan for the idea: truth, he says, is a kind of theft. In *Being and Time* he writes, "truth (uncoveredness) is something that must always first be wrested from entities. Entities get snatched out of their hiddenness. The factical uncoveredness of anything is, as it were, always a kind of robbery [*Raub*]" (SZ 294). He says the same thing again about a year later, and often thereafter: "If this robbery belongs to the concept of truth, then it says that the entity must first of all be wrested from concealedness, or its concealedness must be taken from the entity" (GA27:29; see also GA9:223/171; GA19:10–11; GA28:359; GA29/30:44; GA34:10, 126). But this is odd. If entities are "always already" uncovered for Dasein, how can our uncovering of them be a kind of predation or theft?

One reason Heidegger talks this way is that he wants to emphasize the fact that entities are in many ways independent of us – independent, for example, of our perceptions, beliefs, wishes, intentions, and purposes. This means that uncovering things demands something of us: it requires us to struggle and foster and develop the right skills, attitudes, and bodily dispositions for dealing with things and letting them show up in their "essence," that is, as what they *are*. Heidegger illustrates this by describing a shoemaker's workshop: "which entities are there and how these entities are available, in line with their inherent character, is unveiled for us only in dealing appropriately with equipment such as tools, leather, and shoes. Only one who understands is able to uncover by himself this environing world of the shoemaker" (GA24:431). For most of us, the entities in the workshop are not in fact uncovered, or could be uncovered only if we come to acquire the appropriate skills. And what is true of the workshop is true of the world as a whole:

> it is only in the smallest spheres of entities with which we are acquainted that we are so well versed as to have at our command the specific way of dealing with equipment

that uncovers it as such. The entire range of intraworldly entities accessible to us at any time is not suitably accessible to us in an equally original way. There are many things we merely know about, but are not able to manage. They confront us as entities, to be sure, but as unfamiliar entities. Many entities, including even those already uncovered, have the character of unfamiliarity. (GA24:431–32)

We tend to cover up and evade this unfamiliarity, however. Indeed, Heidegger believes that we always inherit an understanding of and a disposition toward the world that conceals from us the fact that we cannot practically uncover most things.

The understandings, dispositions, and skills that Dasein has at the outset are the banalized understanding, DISPOSEDNESS, and skills of "the ANYONE" (*das Man*). Thus, entities are initially manifest, but concealed in what they most authentically are: "the anyone does not uncover the movements of being that Dasein so to speak makes, since the uncoveredness that the anyone cultivates is in fact a covering up" (GA20:389). AUTHENTICITY, by contrast, consists in Dasein learning to "uncover the world in its own way . . ., this uncovering of the 'world' [is] . . . always accomplished as a clearing away of concealments and obscurities, as a breaking up of the disguises with which Dasein bars its own way" (SZ 129).

Another way in which entities are independent of us is that, no matter how skillful we are, there will always be more to them than we can deal with: "each entity we encounter and that encounters us keeps to this curious opposition of presencing in which it always holds itself back in a concealment" (GA5:40/30). This concealment "is not in every case primarily and merely the limit of knowledge," but rather what makes it possible for us to deal with the thing in the first place: it is "the beginning of the clearing of what is cleared" (GA5:40/30).

One consequence of Heidegger's account is that entities can only be uncovered on the basis of our skillful ability to inhabit a world, since we uncover things only by knowing how they work together with other things in a CONTEXT. The uncoveredness of entities is thus dependent on the disclosedness of a world and ways of being within the world. Our practical, reflective, and linguistic ability to uncover the way things are requires that objects make themselves available to our thought and talk, and that our thought and talk make themselves responsive and responsible to objects in the world around us. The unconcealment of entities is what gives us objects toward which we can be directed, and about which we can be responsible for getting it right or wrong: "if our representations and assertions . . . are supposed to conform to the object, then this entity . . . must be accessible in advance in order to present itself as a standard and measure for the conformity with it" (GA45:18).

Although this might seem like a trivial point, it is important to recognize that it is only possible for things to manifest themselves in themselves if there is a way that the world really is, and moreover if it shows itself to us as it really is. Heidegger describes this disclosure of the world in *Being and Time* (SZ 221–22) and refers to it again in passages like the following from the 1928 essay, "On the Essence of Ground":

Human Dasein – an entity that finds itself *in the midst* of entities, comporting itself *toward* entities – in so doing exists in such a way that entities are always manifest as a WHOLE. Here it is not necessary that this wholeness be expressly conceptualized; its belonging to Dasein can be veiled, the expanse of this whole is changeable. This wholeness is understood without the whole of those entities that are manifest being explicitly grasped or indeed "completely" investigated in their specific connections,

domains, and layers. Yet the understanding of this wholeness, an understanding that in each case reaches ahead and embraces it, is a surpassing in the direction of world.... World as a wholeness "is" not an entity, but that from out of which Dasein *gives itself the signification* of whatever entities it *is able* to comport itself toward in whatever way. (GA9:156/121)

What passages like this add to the account in *Being and Time* is the claim that the world itself makes an essential contribution to unconcealment; that it is "*through the world*" that Dasein "gives itself an original view (image [*Bild*]) that is not explicitly grasped, yet functions precisely as an exemplar [*Vor-bild*] for all manifest entities" (GA9:158/123, emphasis added).

Beginning in the mid-1930s, as he came to appreciate the essentially historical nature of Dasein's disclosedness, Heidegger began to ask what makes it possible for any one of a plurality of understandings of being to prevail. Part of the answer he arrived at was that there must be a "clearing" that allows one way for Dasein to be disposed to the world to come into effect, while withholding other possible ways of being disposed. A clearing is a space of possibilities; it "grants first of all the POSSIBILITY of the path to presence and grants the possible PRESENCING of that presence itself. We must think 'Αλήθεια, unconcealment, as the clearing that first grants being and THINKING their presence to and for each other" (GA14:84). The clearing makes it possible for a certain understanding of being – a particular mode of presence – to come to prevail. For there to be live or genuine, as opposed to merely abstract or theoretical, possibilities, however, there must be a space that excludes other, incompatible modes of presencing. The clearing maintains a world by keeping back (concealing) possibilities that are incompatible with the presencing that is currently in effect. In order for some possibilities to be in effect and shape our experience and understanding of the world, other configurations of intelligibility must be ruled out; they cannot be possible for us; they must be concealed.

This might make it sound like the clearing is a gallery of possibilities; that it keeps different determinate ways of being-in-the-world locked in a kind of back room, as it were, exhibiting only one at a time. To see why this is the wrong way to think about it, recall that in ordinary English, as in German, a "clearing" (*Lichtung*) is a glade, an open space in a forest. The clearing in a wood does not manage to be a clearing simply by presenting some trees and moving others out of the way or out of sight. Rather, the forest clearing just *is* the fact that there are no trees in it. Similarly, the clearing (in Heidegger's sense) makes some possibilities possible not by putting others offline or in cold storage, but by making it the case that no other possibilities are available. For the prevailing possibilities to have authority as possibilities, moreover, it cannot be manifest at all that other possibilities have been ruled out or concealed. Our technological experience of nature *as* a stockpile of natural resources, for example, could not authoritatively shape our experience of the world if we also thought that one could with equal justification experience it as God's creation. This means that, paradoxically, the clearing works as a clearing only when it is not uncovered, when it is something toward which we cannot comport at all. The clearing thus not only keeps back other possibilities, it also keeps back *that* it is keeping back other possibilities. The clearing conceals the possibility of other understandings of being. It is not "the mere clearing of presence, but the clearing of presence concealing itself, the clearing of a self-concealing sheltering" (GA14:88).

Mark A. Wrathall and Taylor Carman

214.

UNDERSTANDING (*VERSTEHEN*)

"Understanding" is the capacity to disclose the contexts that give an action or experience its meaning or sense. Understanding discloses by projecting entities, actions, and events onto possibilities. To project onto possibilities is to see something in terms of what it signifies and affords, where this necessarily includes grasping how the significance and affordances alter systematically and predictably along with changes in the environing circumstances.

For instance, to understand a golf sand wedge is to see it as affording swinging in such a way as to strike golf balls and lift them out of sand while lobbing them over the grassy banks of a sand bunker. But to truly understand a golf wedge, one must also see how the swinging that the sand wedge affords will change, depending on changes to its relationships to other entities (people standing nearby, the distance from the hole, the depth to which the ball is buried in the sand, the height of the banks, and so on).

All comportments are enabled by the structure of projecting onto possibilities. Bodily skills are paradigmatic cases for helping us recognize the structure of projection, and they present our most basic forms of insertion into a world. The world-disclosive function of the understanding is to insert us into a world, which shows up as a space within which we can pursue a variety of possibilities and take any one of an indeterminate number of possible stands on our own existence.

Along with disposedness and discourse, understanding is one of the structural elements of existential interiority – we are situated *in* a world in virtue of the way that understanding, disposedness, and discourse mutually co-determine each other. Different particular acts of understanding – knowing how to do such-and-such, being able to represent or explain or predict such and such – are manifestations of the more fundamental existential structure of understanding.

I EXISTENTIAL INTERIORITY

To make sense of Heidegger's account of understanding, it is important to pay attention to the role that understanding plays in the argument of *Being and Time*. Heidegger analyzes understanding in the course of his account of existential interiority – that is, as he is trying to make sense of the kind of "insideness" that existing beings like us humans have. To be a Dasein is to exist *in* a world. This human or existential interiority is different from the interiority of an occurrent being, which is inside another occurrent being when its outer perimeter is contained within the spatially extended boundaries of the other occurrent being.

> Dasein is never occurrent in space, not even in the first instance. It does not, like a real thing or item of equipment, fill up a bit of space in such a way that its limits are to the space surrounding it a merely spatial determination. (SZ 368)

Human interiority is also different from the interiority of the AVAILABLE: EQUIPMENT is *in*volved with its environment when it is circumscribed by an equipmental WHOLE. Such involvement in a context of equipment is "the specific spatiality of entities encountered in the environment" (SZ 101). Equipmental interiority means being *in* a context of equipment, which amounts to functioning well with the other items of equipment in the workspace.

Human interiority, by contrast, is a matter of *in*habiting. I am in a world in the relevant sense when I am familiar with the way of life that the world sustains. Existential interiority is thus to be understood in terms of a kind of intimate understanding of how things work and how to fit in – the kind of "in-ness" invoked when I say "I'm at home in Southern California." This doesn't mean I have a house that is physically located somewhere in California to the south of the 35th parallel north. It means rather that I'm used to, and able to flourish when participating in, the activities, the attitudes, and the ambitions that characterize the southern Californian style and pace of life. I possess the habits and skills to respond to the affordances of that world, and when I am in that world I thrive in pursuing my concerns.

In Division 1, chap. 5 of *Being and Time*, Heidegger offers an analysis of the structure of the familiarity with a world that makes up existential interiority. Heidegger's discussion of understanding, interpretation, disposedness, and discourse, *is* that analysis. What is involved in being familiar with a world, *in*timate with it, so that one can be said to *in*habit it? It involves things and activities showing up as varying in weight or importance, with a plenitude of affordances differentially drawing or repelling me on an affective level. Disclosing these differentials of weightiness or mattering is the contributions made by disposedness to my interiority in a world, and it gives me a specific responsiveness to how things matter.

Another fundamental condition of inhabiting a world is possessing an ability to recognize the possibilities that are open to an inhabitant of that world in any given situation, and anticipating how those possibilities will change systematically in response to changes in the situation. The disclosure of a world's possibilities is the job of the understanding. This understanding is further developed and enriched as one pursues some concrete set of possibilities, thereby taking up a particular stance or perspective on the world. Heidegger calls this development and enactment of the understanding "INTERPRETATION."

Finally, when I am in a world, I also share with other inhabitants a general sense of what's what, how things stand, and what they mean. Discourse is the structure that allows me to discriminate, respond to, and communicate with others regarding the more or less stable nodes of SIGNIFICATION that make up a meaningful world. Discourse articulates and stabilizes nodes of signification, making them salient – it is "the articulation according to significations of the disposed understandability of BEING-IN-THE-WORLD" (SZ 162).

We are truly *in* a world – familiar with it and at home there – when these three structural moments of disposedness, understanding, and discourse are well-integrated with each other and sustained by the world. That is, our integrated disposedness-understanding-discursive articulation must be such as to succeed in responding to the possibilities afforded by the world in which we dwell. Let's look in more detail at Heidegger's account of the contribution of understanding to existential interiority.

2 THE STRUCTURE OF UNDERSTANDING

We have seen that the role of the understanding is to contribute to our familiarity with the world by letting us see things – entities, activities, situations, social roles – in terms of their possibilities. Heidegger calls this seeing in terms of possibilities "projection" onto possibilities: "in its projective character, understanding goes to make up existentially what we call Dasein's 'sight'" (SZ 146). To project onto possibilities is to anticipate or foresee, on the basis of present conditions, how different actions or events will generate a new configuration of possibilities. This is why the "understanding is grounded primarily in the future" (SZ 340). Each situation presents an agent with a variety of different affordances or invitations to act. It is the understanding, by projecting onto possibilities, that gives us "leeway" (*Spielraum*) for action as it allows us to not be driven by what most immediately presses on us.

To project onto possibilities is to have an expectation of the significance that changes in the present situation would have for (a) what the agent aims ultimately to achieve – her FOR-THE-SAKE-OF-WHICH, and (b) what the successor situation affords for the agent to do, and (c) how other co-inhabitants of the world will respond:

> Why does the understanding – whatever may be the essential dimensions of that which can be disclosed in it – always penetrate into possibilities? It is because the understanding has in itself the existential structure which we call "projection." With equal primordiality the understanding projects Dasein's being both upon its "for-the-sake-of-which" and upon significance, as the worldhood of its current world. (SZ 145)

> The understandability, as well as the lack of understanding, of Dasein and of co-Dasein always varies in direct relation to the understanding of the world, and vice versa. The current discoveredness of Dasein and of being-with-one-another modifies the understanding of the world, that means, understanding is always as a whole what it is in the sense of the being of the discoveredness of Dasein.... [A]n understanding of world, Dasein, and co-Dasein belongs to every understanding as such. (GA20:357)

Because we understand by projecting onto possibilities, and because the possibilities that are open at any given moment are a function of the intersection of my own aims and skills, the aims and skills of other agents in the vicinity, and the state of the world, it makes no sense to think we could understand something in isolation.

The projection onto possibilities – the foreseeing of how various actions or events will change the affordances of the situation and undermine or advance me toward achieving my aims – need not be something I thematically grasp or work out explicitly in advance, like a beginning chess player imagining a sequence of moves and countermoves (SZ 145). The way we experience or see everything carries inherently and integrally within itself an implicit expectation of the way affordances will shift in response to events:

> Dasein is thrown into the kind of Being which we call "projecting." Projecting has nothing to do with comporting oneself towards a plan that has been thought out, and in accordance with which Dasein arranges its Being. On the contrary, any

> Dasein has, as Dasein, already projected itself; and as long as it is, it is projecting. As long as it is, Dasein always has understood itself and always will understand itself in terms of possibilities. Furthermore, the character of understanding as projection is such that the understanding does not grasp thematically that upon which it projects – that is to say, possibilities. (SZ 145)

As I drive down the motorway, for instance, I don't have to work out explicitly how depressing the pedal will alter the relative position of my vehicle to the exit ahead and the automobiles on either side. The accelerator shows up directly as soliciting me to depress it because I already foresee that doing that will change the affordances of the situation in such a way that I can better pursue my aims. This direct grasp (that is, my immediate sense of the way actions and other events will change the affordances of a situation) pervades all kinds of understanding – the understanding of language, or social norms, of mathematical theorems and proofs, of equipment, and of human being itself. A fluent speaker of a language, for instance, doesn't need to work out her entire sentence in advance. Instead, each word she utters bears a weight on the words that will follow, dictating their grammatical form and constraining the order and selection of precise terms. In projecting, we grasp a thing not in terms of its present, self-contained, occurrent properties but in terms of "what it becomes or respectively doesn't become" (SZ 145). Heidegger also describes projection in terms of transparency – we understand things to the degree they are transparent, meaning we understand them better as we can see through to more and more of the possibilities that they afford (SZ 146). Thus, "projection unveils without making what is unveiled as such into an object of contemplation" (GA24:393).

The immediacy or directness of the projective understanding has encouraged the thought that understanding simply is "know-how," the ability to cope skillfully and fluidly with the environment, as opposed to a more explicit form of "knowing that." Dreyfus has been the most important advocate of this view, and his interpretation of understanding has exerted a tremendous influence over Anglophone readings of Heidegger for the last quarter century. Dreyfus argues that

> for Heidegger primordial understanding is know-how.... To understand a hammer, for example, does not mean to know that hammers have such and such properties and that they are used for certain purposes – or that in order to hammer one follows a certain procedure, i.e., that one grasps the hammer in one's hand, etc. Rather, understanding a hammer at its most primordial means knowing how to hammer. (Dreyfus 1991, 184)

Others have closely followed Dreyfus in treating understanding as skillful practical activity. For William Blattner, "to understand something is to be able to do or manage or master it" (Blattner 2006, 85). Taylor Carman likewise explains that "understanding means competence, skill, know-how" (Carman 2003, 19).

Heidegger is certainly committed to the primacy of understanding over cognition. "Understanding," Heidegger says, "is not an acquaintance derived from knowledge, but a primordially existential kind of being, which, more than anything else, makes such knowledge and acquaintance possible" (SZ 123–24). By insisting on the primacy of understanding over

cognition, Heidegger means to deprive cognition of its traditional role in defining human nature. To understand is to *be* in a certain way, to embody a particular way of existing in the world, rather than to think or believe or know that such and such is the case. But this is not to deny that thinking and believing and knowing are forms of understanding. Rather, it is to insist that not all understanding consists in cognition, and thus to recognize cognition as a specific mode of understanding rather than definitive of what it is to understand: "'understanding' in the sense of one possible kind of cognizing among others (as distinguished, for instance, from 'explaining'), must, like explaining, be interpreted as an existential derivative of that primary understanding which is one of the constituents of the being of the 'there' in general" (SZ 143).

But it is a mistake to take this "primary understanding" as one particular kind of activity such as fluid coping. Understanding is not the most basic kind of human activity. It is the structure that makes all human activities *activities* as opposed to mere movements or events (see Wrathall 2013b). For Heidegger, "understanding" names an EXISTENTIAL, an ontological constituent of our BEING-IN-THE-WORLD.

> With the term "understanding" we mean a fundamental existential, which is neither a definite species of cognition distinguished, say, from explaining and conceiving, nor any cognition at all in the sense of grasping something thematically. Understanding constitutes rather the being of the "there" in such a way that, on the basis of such understanding, a Dasein can, in existing, develop the different possibilities of sight, of looking around, and of just looking. All explanation, as the understanding discovery of that which cannot be understood, is rooted in the primary understanding of Dasein. (SZ 336)

Thus not just cognitive activities like explaining or conceiving, but every human action, practice, skill, mental or perceptual state, emotion, mood, or disposition will manifest understanding.

The primary function of understanding is world disclosure. "In the understanding," Heidegger explains, "the relations which are constitutive of the world as world … are held in disclosedness *in advance*. It holds itself in them *with familiarity*; and in so doing, it holds them before itself as that within which its referring operates" (SZ 86–87). Or, put slightly differently,

> the disclosing in advance of that on the basis of which the freeing of that which is encountered within the world occurs – this is nothing other than the understanding of the world, to which the Dasein as an entity always already relates itself. (SZ 86)

The function of understanding, then, is (a) to disclose "in advance" – that is, in a way that is more comprehensive than, and irreducible to, what can be discovered in any particular concrete action – the relations that constitute entities as the entities that they are; and (b) to place us "within" contexts of relationships "with familiarity" – that is, to enable us to know our way around the world, to find it intelligible or understandable. It does this by "projecting onto possibilities," but such projection is a feature of all kinds of human activities and experiences, not merely skillful coping. This projection involves a simultaneous grasp of how I myself, my companions, and the condition of the surrounding world interact to produce the ever-changing set of affordances that will allow me to achieve (or prevent me from achieving) my aims and purposes.

3   SELF-UNDERSTANDING AND AUTHENTICITY

Heidegger devotes particular attention to the understanding involved in self-understanding. He outlines two primary modes of self-understanding, although it is perhaps better to think of these as extreme poles at either end of a spectrum of modes of self-understanding. In inauthentic forms of self-understanding, we understand ourselves entirely in terms of the changing roles we play in established contexts of equipment and in a social order:

> Proximally and for the most part, Dasein understands itself in terms of that which it encounters in the environment and that with which it is circumspectively concerned. This understanding is not just a bare taking cognizance of itself which merely accompanies all of Dasein's comportments. Understanding signifies one's project-ing oneself upon one's current possibility of being-in-the-world; that is to say, it signifies existing as this possibility. In this way understanding, as common sense, also constitutes the inauthentic existence of the anyone. What our everyday concern encounters in public life is not merely equipment and work, but rather at the same time what "goes" along with it: the "business affairs," the ventures, the incidents and accidents. The "world" belongs to everyday doings and dealings [*Handel und Wandel*] as both the soil from which they grow and the arena in which they are displayed. In a public mode of being with one another, the others are encountered in a hustle and bustle [*Treiben*] in which the "anyone self" "goes with the flow" [*mitschwimmt*]. One is acquainted with this hustle and bustle, discusses it, encourages it, fights against it, remembers and forgets it, but always primarily with regard to what is carried on in it and "springs forth" from it. In the first instance, we evaluate the individual Dasein's progress, stagnation, transformation, and "end result" in terms of the progress, status, change, and availability of that with which he or she is concerned. (SZ 387–88)

In an inauthentic self-understanding, in other words, the self is assessed in terms of or projected onto its impact on the pattern of activity in which all participate (see SELFHOOD). Here, "the understanding, as a projection onto the possibilities of being, has diverted itself into" its world (SZ 221–22). This, at the same time, "disguises" or "closes off" entities (SZ 222), since they are no longer projected onto possibilities that exceed those countenanced by the shared, public understanding of the world. Heidegger calls this disguised or occluded understanding of the self and what the world affords "FALLING."

At the other pole, an authentic self-understanding is an "understanding as a self-projection onto one's ownmost being-GUILTY" (SZ 296), as well as an "existential projection" onto DEATH (SZ 260). Here, one understands oneself not in terms of one's place in the hustle and bustle, the doings and dealings of everyday life, but instead in terms of one's individual ability-to-be a self (SZ 307). See AUTHENTICITY.

4   THE UNDERSTANDING OF BEING

The most fundamental form of projecting onto possibilities is projecting onto the possi-bilities that are definitive of the being of an entity. "In the projecting of the under-standing, entities are disclosed in their possibility," Heidegger reminds us, and "the

character of the possibility corresponds, on each occasion, with the kind of being of the entity which is understood" (SZ 151). After all, to project some entity onto any possibilities in the first place requires some background sense of what it is to be *that entity*. This is because in projecting the entity onto changed possibilities, its specific relationships to other things will be different. One can only sensibly know that it is the same entity in different circumstances if one grasps which of the relationships are definitive of the entity, and which are not.

> We are able to grasp entities as such, as entities, only if we understand something like being. If we did not understand, even though at first roughly and without conceptual comprehension, what actuality signifies, then the actual would remain hidden from us. If we did not understand what reality means, then the real would remain inaccessible. If we did not understand what life and vitality signify, then we would not be able to comport ourselves toward living beings. If we did not understand what existence and existentiality signify, then we ourselves would not be able to exist as Dasein. If we did not understand what permanence and constancy signify, then constant geometric relations or numerical proportions would remain a secret to us. We must understand actuality, reality, vitality, existentiality, constancy in order to be able to comport ourselves positively toward specifically actual, real, living, existing, constant entities.... To say that the understanding of being precedes all factual experience of entities does not mean that we would first need to have an explicit concept of being in order to experience entities theoretically or practically. We must understand being – being, which may no longer itself be called an entity, being, which does not occur as an entity among other entities but which nevertheless must be given and in fact is given in the understanding of being. (GA24:10–11)

In Heidegger's later writings, his focus shifts away from the existential structure of human being, and accordingly the concept of the understanding as a structure of existential interiority appears only infrequently. He does, however, develop at some length the idea of a plurality of different understandings of being (see History of Being). Although he does not offer a detailed account of what a historical understanding of being consists in, it is perhaps safe to assume that he continues to think of such an understanding in terms of a projection of entities onto their possibilities. When he does discuss the understanding in his later work, it is clear that Heidegger continues to think of the understanding as a structure that can't be reduced to cognition or explanatory intelligibility (see, e.g., GA39:246–47). The understanding also continues to be thought of in terms of projection (see, e.g., GA49:41).

Mark A. Wrathall

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 13, 86–87, 142–53, 167, 174, 178, 196, 201, 221–22, 262, 270, 296–98, 307, 315, 324, 336–40, 349–50, 353, 363, 387; GA3:227, 235; GA9:377/286; GA19:75; GA20:299, 355, 357ff., 365–66, 369, 371, 411ff.; GA21:150; GA22:207–08, 262; GA24:21, 24–25, 29, 389–96, 402, 405–07, 416, 423, 429, 451; GA25:23, 224; GA26:16, 20, 187, 211; GA27:21–22, 213, 313, 332; GA28:276, 278; GA31:125;

GA32:92; GA34:52, 57, 104; GA39:246–47; GA40:89/87–88; GA46:275; GA49:41, 56, 68; GA58:185, 238; GA65:259–60; GA66:208; GA70:9

FURTHER READING

Blattner 2006, 84–97, Carman 2003, 18–22, Dreyfus 1991, 184–214, Wrathall 2013b

<div align="center">

UPON-WHICH, THE (*DAS WORAUFHIN*). SEE IN-TERMS-OF-WHICH.

UPSURGENCE (*AUFGANG*). SEE EMERGENCE.

UPSWING (*ÜBERSCHWUNG*). SEE OSCILLATION.

UR-TEMPORALITY (*TEMPORALITÄT*). SEE TEMPORALITY.

URGENCY (*NOT*). SEE EMERGENCY.

USEFUL THING (*ZEUG*). SEE EQUIPMENT.

</div>

V

215.
VALUE (*WERT*)

ALTHOUGH HEIDEGGER SOMETIMES uses the term colloquially, employed in a technical sense "value" (*Wert*) refers to a property of entities that picks out a standard according to which we assess those entities and orient our activity. For example, beauty is a value in the sense that when we call a landscape "beautiful," we assess the landscape according to some standard of beauty, and we orient ourselves according to this standard, perhaps by lingering to take in the scenery. Heidegger notes that the notion is a modern and derivative one: the Greeks had no concept of value, understood as a property of entities, but only of the GOOD (*agathon*) as a standard that constitutes the WORLD and that guides activity in the world (GA10:23/15–16; GA17:276; GA18:305–06). Later in his career, Heidegger distinguishes "valuing" (*Wertung*) from *Würdigung* – valuation in the sense of appreciation, derived from the German for "dignity" (*Würde*): while valuing implies measuring according to a standard, dignity cannot be measured (GA69:171).

The philosophy of value (*Wertphilosophie*), introduced by Lotze, advanced in various forms by Brentano, Scheler, and Hartmann, and championed by the neo-Kantians Windelband, Rickert, and Lask, is a philosophical movement and loose-knit position that sharply distinguishes a realm of value from a realm of fact: facts *are* or *exist*, and values do not, but merely *hold* or *are valid* (*gelten*, *gültig sein*).

After his habilitation thesis, where he identifies a *Wertproblem* or "value problem" that has remained unquestioned in philosophy (GA1:405/S 65), Heidegger tackles the concept of value in his 1919 Freiburg lecture courses, directed especially at his mentor Rickert. Heidegger notes that the "intention" of value philosophy is "to thoroughly expel everything connected with being [*alles Seinsmäßige*] from the philosophical problematic, and to constitute the latter as a pure science of value" (GA56/57:54). Yet, as Heidegger points out, Rickert argues that if there are sentences that are true, then TRUTH, understood as a value, must exist in some sense. This leaves Rickert with an unsatisfactory definition of values as "for structures which do not exist and yet are something" (GA56/57:202). This definition is especially troubling, since for Rickert the content of all judgments, and hence all claims to knowledge, are "unreal," ideal meanings that are valid eternally – i.e., not facts or entities but values (GA56/57:199; GA20:41–46). So philosophers of value are left with a "fundamental problem, by reference to which the basic character of LOGIC (of theoretical philosophy) and of philosophy in general is to be decided" (GA56/57:199): they have no account of the being of values, and yet values are the only true objects of knowledge.

In *Being and Time*, Heidegger offers a diagnosis of the value problem and the understanding of being that it presupposes. Heidegger argues that modern philosophy since Descartes tries to understand entities in the world in terms of extension, which can be quantified. The entities of the world are thus knowable in terms of their quantifiable properties like shape, location, and – given the appropriate means of quantification – color. But Heidegger points out that most of the entities we encounter in the world are not

encountered as purely OCCURRENT (*vorhanden*) things of nature (*Naturdinge*, GA63:89). Entities often appear to us as AVAILABLE for our use (*zuhanden*), and HUMAN BEINGS are entities not defined by their properties but by their EXISTENCE (*Existenz*). In order to account for other kinds of entities, the Cartesian account of the world treats qualities such as "'beautiful,' 'ugly,' 'appropriate,' 'inappropriate,' 'useful,' 'useless'" as "non-quantifiable, value-predicates by which what is in the first instance just a material thing, gets stamped as something good" (SZ 99). In this way, Cartesian metaphysics attempts to "round out the thing of nature until it becomes a full-fledged thing of use" (SZ 99).

By "rounding out" occurrent entities with values so that they have the characteristics of other kinds of entities, this approach conceals the fact that not all entities in the world have the same kind of being. Heidegger writes, "adding on value-predicates cannot tell us anything at all new about the being of goods, *but would merely presuppose again that goods have pure occurrentness* [*Vorhandenheit*] *as their kind of being*" (SZ 99). If you begin with a conception of the entity in the world as a material thing, and add normative properties ("value-predicates"), then you are not in a position to grasp the distinctive ontological status of the entities that have these characteristics. At the ontological level of analysis, tools are useful not because we "stick a value on" them (SZ 150), but because they are involved in or relevant to ways human beings can act in the world. Similarly, human beings guide their behavior not by "actualizing values" or "satisfying a norm" (SZ 293), but by taking a stand on their being. Truth is only conceived as a value because it is thought of as correctness, a property of a proposition (GA17:178; GA34:14). Heidegger's conception of TRUTH as unhiddenness (ALÊTHEIA, *Unverborgenheit*), is not a "value" that guides our behavior but the condition of being open to understanding a proposition in the first place (SZ 227).

In Heidegger's later work, the concept of value arises most significantly in Heidegger's confrontation with Nietzsche's philosophy. Heidegger calls Nietzsche's thinking "the metaphysics of values" (GA5:227/170). For Nietzsche, a value is essentially a "viewpoint" (GA5:227/170): values express how an agent represents something, such that that thing can enhance the agent's power (or *life*). Thus Nietzsche's fundamental metaphysical principle, the will to POWER, expresses the necessity of life to posit values (*Wert-setzung*) (GA5:231/172–73). In Nietzsche, "being has become value" (GA5:258/192), but "being" here refers to what entities have in common (*das Seiende als solche*) rather than being itself (*Sein*) (GA5:259/193–94). So while Nietzsche recognizes the devaluation of our highest values under the term "NIHILISM," he remains "imprisoned in value-representation" (GA5:102/77), and the understanding of being that it manifests. By the end of his career, Heidegger associates values, along with goals and ideals, with the "GIGANTIC" (*Riesenhaft*) and the reckoning and MACHINATION (*Machenschaft*) of modern technological thinking (GA65:442, 462).

Patrick Londen

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Philosophy of value GA1:191, 230; GA21:82–87; GA29/30:482; GA56/57:54, 127–29, 138, 140–51; GA58:8, 73; GA59:68–71, 156

Truth as a value GA1:337; SZ 227; GA5:240/179; GA17:278; GA20:27; GA28:359; GA34:14, 72; GA56/57:42–43, 51, 140, 193, 199; GA65:63, 21; GA67:38, 156

Value GA1:134, 198, 215, 260–61, 337, 405–06/ S 65–66, 410/S 68, 427/BH 68, 433/BH72; SZ 63, 68, 80, 99–100, 150, 286, 293–94; GA5:24/18, 69/51–52, 101–02/76–77; GA7:75/EP 90; GA9:349/265; GA17:278; GA20:41–46, 373–75; GA21:82–85; GA22:284; GA28:359; GA34:14, 72, 109; GA36/

37:288; GA53:19, 109; GA56/57:41–54, 138, 152, 174, 202; GA59:11, 13–15, 159–60, 162–63; GA60:16, 39, 316–18; GA62:331; GA63:89; GA64:23–24; GA65:63, 72, 216, 218, 221, 234, 442, 462; GA69:39, 171, 201; GA71:101, 167; GA74:5, 13; GA75:352; GA76:103, 131; GA78:69–70

Value and *agathon* GA9:227/174; GA10:23/15; GA17:276; GA18:305–06; GA19:123; GA22:141; GA26:237; GA34:109; GA40:205–08/210–13

Value and dignity GA35:77; GA67:62; GA69:171; GA71:316

Value in Nietzsche GA5:217–67/162–99; GA6.2:13–16, 21/N3 173–77, 182; GA6.2:23–40/N4 3–17, 236–54/N3 192–204; GA55:84, 180, 206, 347; GA66:384; GA67:38, 50, 62, 116, 156, 163, 178, 195–99, 204, 226

FURTHER READING

Dewalque 2005, Emad 1981a, Kisiel 1993, Kisiel 1995, Lyne 2000, Mongis 1976, Young 1995

VIBRATION (*SCHWINGUNG*). SEE OSCILLATION.

VICINITY (*NÄHE*). SEE CLOSENESS.

VICISSITUDE (*GESCHICK*). SEE DESTINY.

W

WANT (*NOT*). **SEE EMERGENCY.**

216.
WAY (*WEG*)

A way is a path or a track along which thought is drawn or invited to move, in contrast to a method in philosophy that drives thought to a conclusion or dictates to thought its direction. The comparison of THINKING to a way results from Heidegger's critique of representationalism. Representationalism is not only fallacious METAPHYSICS; its ontological errors commit it to a misguided form of "doing philosophy." Rather than following an emerging movement of thought, representationalist philosophy attempts to assimilate itself to a procedure leading to results already anticipated in advance. Describing thinking as a way or a path thus involves a normative dimension in that it indicates how philosophy should be pursued.

Way translates the German *Weg*, also translated into English as *path* or *track*. Heidegger at times refers to the Greek *hodós* as a synonym for *Weg*. The notion most notably articulates Heidegger's understanding of his own philosophizing, as he alludes to it in particular in the titles of the major collections of essays he published during his lifetime: *Holzwege* (*Off the beaten track*, GA5), *Wegmarken* (*Pathmarks*, GA9), and *Unterwegs zur Sprache* (*On the way to language*, GA12). Heidegger expressed the wish that his collected works be preceded by the motto "Paths, not works" (*Wege, nicht Werke*, GA1:437–40).

Heidegger often refers to thinking as a way in reflections on the nature of philosophy. The idea is presented most consequentially in a philosophical dialogue on the nature of thinking. Tellingly, the dialogue is named *Conversation on a Country Path* (*Feldweg-Gespräch*, GA77). The philosophical dialogue is said to take place during a walk in the country, with repeated reference to progress that has been reached, to involuntary slowdown or to being on a wrong track and searching to regain the right path. By the end of the dialogue, the interlocutors have returned to where they started. They have not reached a specific conclusion but report their thinking to have changed. They also plan to continue their conversation when taking another walk.

This composition of the text enacts the idea that philosophy is to be understood as pursuing a path. At some point of the conversation, the path the interlocutors follow is identified with "releasement itself" (GA77:118/76). This echoes a claim made in the dialogue: that thinking as specific to human nature can be described in reference to RELEASEMENT (*Gelassenheit*). Both the means of arriving at this particular insight and the activity of thinking itself are presented not as an argument from premises resulting in a set of claims. Heidegger's text rather attempts to capture thinking as a shared transformative experience. Releasement, as the nature of human thinking, is both the path (*Weg*) and the MOVEMENT (*Bewegung*) on this way (GA77:118/77).

Heidegger in the *Country Path Conversation* develops a conception of thinking intended to serve as a contrast for thinking in the mode of releasement. This contrast is thinking as *representing* (*Vorstellen*, also *Vor-stellen*, "setting-before"). Such thinking inadvertently commits to metaphysical representationalism. Rather than merely describing our access

to the real, a representationalist account of transcendental conditions of knowledge confuses our access to the WORLD with the world itself. Thinking as representing imposes specific forms of knowledge of the real, making phenomenological description without presupposition impossible.

The dominant form of representationalism in modern philosophy is the idea of a philosophical method resulting from its own orientation toward the sciences. This is most evident in Descartes' *Regulae* and *Discourse on Method*. This orientation and a methodology of following given rules is to be overcome by conceiving of thinking as a path. Having "a method and a way of thinking" (or *méthodos* and *hodós*, respectively) are mutually exclusive. Thinking as method relies on an objectifying "procedure" that "chases after" the subject-MATTER (*Sache*). Rather than such an imposition upon reality, thinking should be an "experiencing." Only as such can it be true to its subject-matter of thinking (GA13:233).

The idea that for progress in philosophy there are "no paths prepared in advance" (GA69:170) entails that there is very little to be said generally as to how philosophy is to proceed. Yet a few characteristics emerge from Heidegger's discussions: (1) as becomes clear from Heidegger's philosophical dialogue, thinking takes place in conversation. Thus the development of a conversation can be likened to following a path. (2) In contrast to a hyperbolic concern for methodological correctness, philosophy should be the "simple business of thought" (GA11:152/HR 304). (3) Heidegger further emphasizes that a movement of thought should begin with a "STEP BACK" (*Schritt zurück*), a bracketing of naive convictions and philosophical prejudices; genuine progress in thinking is conditioned by continuously putting in question prior assumptions. Heidegger can thus say that "stepping back" may evolve into "a long path" (GA11:59/ID 50). (4) With respect to the question "What is philosophy?" Heidegger remarks that, in the process of thinking, that very question has become "itself a way" (GA11:12/WP 41) for philosophy to proceed. Questions and the words used to formulate them can thus provide preliminary orientation for thinking. (5) A way of thinking is not isolated but belongs to alternative ways in a "field of ways" (*Wegfeld*, GA13:233).

Tobias Keiling

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

Way and method GA12:168f./OWL 74ff; GA13:233–35; GA54:87; GA81:41, 43
Way and movement GA5:281/210; GA8:174/169; GA12:159, 249/OWL 66, 129; GA61:157
Way and overview GA54:120
Way and language GA12:227–57/OWL 111–36
Way and *tao* GA12:187/OWL 92

FURTHER READING

Crowell 2001a, 203–21, von Herrmann 1992, Pöggeler 1987

217.
WHAT-; WHERE-; WHICH (*WO-* . . .)

I N GENERAL, HEIDEGGER uses *wo-* terms, paradigmatically in Division I of *Being and Time*, to specify at once (1) the *existential (i.e., concretely lived) situatedness* of the human being (DASEIN) in the course of this entity's distinctive way of existing; and (2) the *primarily pragmatic intelligibility* in terms of which this entity makes sense of the WORLD. It is important to understand that (1) and (2) are mutually implicating and not separate conditions that are only sometimes conjoined with each other. It follows that the existential situatedness and primarily pragmatic intelligibility of Dasein (literally in German: to-be-there or being-there) cast this existence either in primarily pragmatic terms in the broadest sense in its everyday existence (see Division I of *Being and Time*); or else in terms that draw their significance and force from how human beings, in certain extreme situations, are deprived of, or otherwise self-consciously break away from, or else reaffirm with a renewed awareness of and commitment to, the primarily pragmatic intelligibility of everyday existence (see Division II of *Being and Time*). Existentiell deprivation of, self-conscious breaking away from, or reaffirmation with a renewed awareness of and commitment to, the primarily pragmatic intelligibility of everyday existence open up in turn new concrete ways of existing for human beings who have undergone this extreme movement concerning how one is BEING-IN-THE-WORLD.

This very brief but abstract characterization of the role that *wo-* terms generally play in *Being and Time* enables us now to explain their predominant meanings in that text. Grammatically speaking, *wo-* serves as a German prefix that, when combined with different German prepositions (e.g., *bei, für, mit, zu, auf, aus, in, vor, um*[1]), forms a variety of expressions whose meanings are above all *contextually* defined in the text. English-speakers may get an initial feel for both the syntax and some of the semantics and pragmatics of the combined terms if *wo-* is literally translated into English as "where-," such that we get (to our contemporary ears rather archaic-sounding) words like "wherefrom," "wherein," "whereby," "whereof," "whereupon," etc. But it is often much more perspicuous to translate Heidegger's uses of *wo-* terms in ways that do not rigidly preserve the "where-" prefix in English, so that their philosophical significance can be best conveyed to non-German speakers.

A particular passage in *Being and Time* brings together how many of the *wo-* terms hang together meaningfully in that text. As Heidegger writes:

> AFFORDANCE (*Bewandtnis*) is the being of intraworldly entities on the basis of which (*worauf*) they are in each case already initially freed [*freigegeben*: i.e., how they already make sense initially to us in our everyday existence]. . . . The amidst-what (*Wobei*) intraworldly entities have affordances is the towards-which (*Wozu*) of serviceability, the for-what (*Wofür*) of usability. With the towards-which (*Wozu*) of serviceability, intraworldly entities can have in turn their affordances. For example, *with* this

---

[1] A linguistic note: When *wo-* in German is combined with such prepositions, an "r" is sometimes added to the formed expressions (e.g., *worauf, woraus, worin, worum*, etc.).

available entity (*mit diesem Zuhandenen*) that we call a hammer, hammering (*beim Hämmern*) is thereby afforded; with hammering fastening (*bei Befestigung*) is afforded; with fastening the protection (*bei Schutz*) against bad weather [is afforded]; this protection "is" for the sake of (*um-willen*) sheltering Dasein, i.e., for the sake of a possibility of its being. *Which* affordance intraworldly entities have with an available entity is prescribed in each case from the affordance-whole. (SZ 84)

This passage illustrates the *holistic pragmatic structure* that situates and makes sense of everyday human activity. For example, *with* (*mit*) a hammer, one uses it *amidst* (*beim*) hammering *in order to* (*um . . . zu*) fasten materials for (*für*) certain purposes, ultimately *for the sake of* (*um . . . willen*) a possible way of being Dasein. Each "node" of this structure is interrelated by being "assigned" or "referred" to (*verwiesen auf*, SZ 68–70, 83f.) one another in terms of the contribution that each "node" makes toward the accomplishment of some determinate set of immediate, intermediate, or long-term goals, ultimately for the sake of some possible way of being Dasein. Consequently, the prepositions typically specify *how* these "nodes" fit *within* some affordance-whole; the *wo-* terms are abstractions of various specific ways in which Dasein and non-Dasein entities in everyday life are interrelated by being assigned or referred to one another for the sake of some possible way of being Dasein. Accordingly (as illustrated paradigmatically in the passage cited above), the *wo-* terms below have, usually, the following meanings in *Being and Time*:

Wobei	the *amidst-what*, i.e., the *activity* – never an entity (*Seiendes*) – amidst which, or in the course or in the "middle" of which, particular phenomena show up meaningfully
Um-Zu	the *in-order-to*, i.e., the *immediate* purpose of using a piece of equipment
Wofür	the *for-what*, i.e., what *intermediately* the use of some equipment is *for*
Womit	the *with-what*, i.e., what *available non-Dasein entity – what piece of equipment –* one uses in carrying out or undergoing some activity
Worauf	the *basis on which* some *configuration of entities* makes sense as a whole
Woraus	the *from-which* or *from-out-of-which*, i.e., some *organized whole* from (out of) which its constituent elements or aspects make sense in light of that organized whole
Worum-Willen	the FOR-THE-SAKE-OF-WHICH, i.e., *some self-interpretation* (e.g., role, occupation, position, practical identity, etc.), whether consciously chosen or simply adopted without any prior reflection, by reference to which a human being's ongoing life makes sense
Wozu	the *toward-which*, i.e., what one *aims to accomplish long-term* in carrying out some activity; the *what-for*, i.e., *why or for what long-term purpose* one does something

A few other *wo-* terms play even more philosophically significant roles in Heidegger's *Being and Time*. The following two are presented and defined interdependently:

Woraufhin	the *on-the-basis-of-which* or *in-terms-of-which* (SZ 86), i.e., the basic *framework* according to which entities show up as making sense in general in life
Worin	the *where-in*, i.e., the *fundamental space or horizon of intelligibility*, within which all entities, including Dasein and co-Daseins, make sense (SZ 86)

As Heidegger writes in an extremely compressed passage, "*Where-in [Worin]* Dasein understands itself antecedently in the mode of self-assigning is the *on-the-basis-of-which [Woraufhin]* of antecedently letting entities show up. *The where-in [Worin] of self-assigning understanding, as the on-the-basis-of-which [Woraufhin] of letting entities in the mode of being of affordance show up, is the phenomenon of the world*" (SZ 86, emphases in the original German). In other words, the everyday WORLD that typically shows up as holistic, practical, and purposive in human beings' lives (the where-in) is coordinate or intimately bound up with human beings' understanding of the world (SZ 86f.), an understanding in light of which (the on-the-basis-of-which) human beings antecedently enable entities to show up as making sense in the world, paradigmatically in terms of entities' practical affordances in their purposive activities.

A more ordinary but multifaceted term that Heidegger uses to refer to the on-the-basis-of-which is SENSE (*Sinn*): "Sense is that where-in [*worin*] the intelligibility of something maintains itself. . . . *Sense is the on-the-basis-of-which of the projection [das Woraufhin des Entwurfs] that is structured by pre-having, pre-view, and pre-conception, from out of which [aus dem her] something as something becomes intelligible*" (SZ 151, emphases in the original German; see FORE-STRUCTURE). In other words, sense in this phenomenologically rich manner is the name of a basic structure (also known as the *worldliness of the world*) that pervades and gives meaningfulness (*Bedeutsamkeit*; cf. SZ 87f., 151; see MEANING) to the world within which human beings understand entities and act in relation or response to them.

There are two final *wo-* terms that deserve brief explication, namely, *Wovor* and *Worum*. They show up initially in the context of the contrast that Heidegger wants to draw between *fear* (*Furcht*) and ANXIETY (*Angst*, SZ §§30 and 40). These terms can be explicated in abstraction as follows:

Wovor   the *in-the-face-of-which*, i.e., some *phenomenon* that affectively worries or troubles Dasein

Worum   the *about-which*, i.e., what it is, in an underlying way, *about* a phenomenon in question that affectively worries or troubles Dasein

Regarding fear, its in-the-face-of-which is some *entity* (*Seiendes*) that *generates fear*; what one fears is always "an intraworldly entity that shows up either with the mode of being of the available, the occurrent, or co-Dasein" (SZ 140). What is important to understand is that the phenomenon in question is some particular *entity or constellation of entities*. The about-which of fear, what it is *about* the feared entity or constellation of entities that worries or troubles a human being, is "that very entity which fears – Dasein" (SZ 141). Consequently, in (being in) fear, both its in-the-face-of-which and about-which have the ontological status of being *entities*.

By contrast, both the in-the-face-of-which and about-which of anxiety are decidedly *not* entities, but concern and reveal the distinctive mode of being of Dasein in general. The in-the-face-of-which of anxiety is *the world as such*, i.e., how the world as a whole can show up to some particular human being as devoid of any significance whatsoever (*die völlige Unbedeutsamkeit*, SZ 187). When human beings are anxious in this extreme and distinctive way, the world can no longer matter to them in any way. In this connection, the about-which of anxiety is BEING-IN-THE-WORLD *as such* (SZ 187) or, more emphatically, the human being's *owned* ABILITY-TO-BE-IN-THE-WORLD (*eigentliches In-der-Welt-sein-können*, SZ 187). In other words, what the about-which of anxiety concerns and reveals is how this ability-to-be-in-the-world fundamentally consists in and depends upon the ability of the human being to *be* (i.e., project and live)

possibilities, including ones whereby a human being, through the experience of anxiety, can be distinctively free for the FREEDOM to choose or seize, or not to choose or seize, itself (SZ 188). Thus, when human beings experience the about-which of anxiety, what gets revealed is their being-in-the-world *as such*, i.e., their ongoing understandings and interpretations of the EXIS-TENTIAL and existentiell possibilities that constitute their lived world *as possibilities*, including ones pertaining to their choice to choose to own, or not to own, their concrete ways of existing.

Jo-Jo Koo

WHILING (*WEILEN*). SEE LINGERING.

218.
WHOLE (*GANZE*)

"WHOLE" REFERS (1) to the holistic nature of the practical contexts we engage with as human agents, and (2) to the possibility of being complete as a human being in a way that maps onto "existential" concerns relating to the human condition, such as finitude, death, meaning in one's life, and so forth (see J. Richardson 2012, 125–26).

When discussing the second sense of wholeness (hereafter wholeness₂), Heidegger typically speaks of it as "being a whole" (*Ganzsein*) or "the ability-to-be-a-whole" (*Ganzseinkönnen*), although he does sometimes use "whole" (*Ganze*) and "wholeness" (*Ganzheit*). However, when he uses "whole" and "wholeness," he is typically discussing the first sense of wholeness (hereafter wholeness₁). The contours of our practical contexts (wholeness₁) depend on our practical aims and projects, and, on Heidegger's account, the way we take up those projects depends on how we approach our finitude, death, and other existential concerns. In Division II of *Being and Time*, for example, Heidegger argues that approaching DEATH with the anticipatory RESOLUTENESS distinctive of AUTHENTICITY is key to our being whole₂, and this wholeness can affect the care structure of wholeness₁.

WHOLENESS 1: THE HOLISTIC NATURE OF PRACTICAL CONTEXTS

Heidegger thinks we distort the nature of our practical contexts and our fundamental understanding of the world when we take the things we encounter as discrete entities and underappreciate the extent to which an entity's essence is determined by the whole – by its relations to other entities and the way these relations are shaped by teleological considerations. To know what something is, we need to understand the ends to which it is put and what it is related to in normal use. Take a pen as an example. If we look at the pen purely in terms of its mass, hardness, or some other physical property or in isolation from its context, we overlook what makes it a pen. We better understand what a pen is when we know what it is for and what it is used with and, especially, when we use the pen in some practical context. The wholes Heidegger has in mind, practical contexts, are constituted by relationships or, in Heidegger's term, REFERENCES. As I work on a paper in my office, my pen relates or refers to notebooks, journal articles, and other books and to activities like note taking. As he puts it in *Being and Time*: "taken strictly, there 'is' no such thing as an EQUIPMENT [or: "a tool"]. To the being of any equipment [tool] there always belongs an equipmental whole (*Zeugganzes*), in which it can be this equipment [tool] that it is" (SZ 68). Objects of practical use – whether pens, hammers, books, or cars – are what they are only by reference to the whole of some practical context.

Our understanding of these practical contexts is best shown in our practical engagement, in our practical familiarity with and ability to navigate the practical context. We understand a pen by writing with it. Typically, we smoothly go about familiar practical contexts without explicit thought about how they are arranged or about the (potentially) discrete items making them up.

We have a practical grasp of the whole through the engaged sight of CIRCUMSPECTION (*Umsicht* – literally seeing [*Sicht*] around or in-order-to [*um*]). In circumspection, Dasein sees the entities *around* it in the environment (*Umwelt*) as connected in a way that allows it to pursue some END, *in-order-to* (*Um-zu*). When baking, I see the counter, flour, water, salt, bowls, and baskets around me as part of a whole organized by the activity of baking bread. Most of the time we go about our lives naturally responding to the practical environment(s) in which we live, using these things without "noticing them expressly" (SZ 74). However, in cases of practical breakdown – when my pen runs out of ink or when there is nothing to write on – I see the (former) whole more as discrete components and notice differently the ways in which they are (or were) related. We typically see the whole explicitly only when something is amiss. When this happens, "the context of equipment [*Der Zeugzusammenhang*] is lit up, not as something never seen before, but as a whole [*Ganzes*] constantly sighted beforehand in circumspection. With this whole, however, the world announces itself" (SZ 75).

WHOLENESS₂: THE HOLISTIC NATURE OF DASEIN

As with everyday objects, Heidegger thinks we distort our understanding of ourselves if we lose sight of the whole of human existence. For Heidegger, Dasein both already is[1] and aspires to be a whole. In both cases, ANXIETY plays a crucial role in Heidegger's analysis of the holistic nature of Dasein. On the one hand, the phenomenon of anxiety allows us to get a clearer view of Dasein as a whole (see, e.g., SZ 190–91, 235–52). But on the other hand, it is the way the individual responds to the paradigmatically "existential" experiences of anxiety and death that allows her to live a more authentic and less fractured life (SZ 329).

With regards to the first function of anxiety, it "shows Dasein as factically existing BEING-IN-THE-WORLD" with "the fundamental ontological characteristics . . . [of] existentiality, FACTI-CITY, and being-fallen" (SZ 191; see also EXISTENCE, FALLING). However, these elements are not "pieces belonging to something composite" (SZ 191). Instead, "a primordial coherence [*Zusammenhang*] is woven into them, which constitutes the wholeness [*Ganzheit*] of the struc-tural whole [*Strukturganzen*] that we are seeking" (SZ 191). Heidegger calls this structural whole the care structure and, as with the other existential structures of Dasein for which wholeness is crucial, it is commonly referred to by "wholeness."[2]

Wholeness can also refer to the wholeness of Dasein made possible through AUTHENTICITY: "in its anticipatory resoluteness, Dasein has now been made visible with regard to its possible authenticity and wholeness [*Ganzheit*]" (SZ 310). The anticipatory resoluteness of authenticity includes "an authentic ability-to-be-a-whole [*Ganzseinkönnen*]" (SZ 317).[3] Something distinc-tive of authenticity, then, is the way in which the self is whole, or unified. What exactly Heidegger has in mind with this wholeness is a matter of debate, but whatever it is, it depends on the right sort of temporal orientation. It involves a unity between the future-oriented understanding, the past-oriented disposedness, and the present-oriented falling (or absorption) (SZ 323–31). In anticipatory resoluteness the agent resolutely takes over her THROWNNESS

---

[1] See SZ 180: "Being-in-the-world is a structure which is primordially and constantly whole [*ganze*]."

[2] See, e.g., the use of *die Ganzheit der Sorgestruktur* in SZ 317, 328.

[3] As Steven Crowell puts it: "Heidegger's ontology of care also conceives SELFHOOD as an unavoidable task of self-unification, a challenge that is met in the existential stance he calls 'anticipatory resoluteness': 'Anticipatory resoluteness . . . includes an authentic ability-to-be-a-whole [*Ganzseinkönnen*]' (SZ 317)" (Crowell 2013, 253).

(past-oriented) in anticipation of her possibilities (future-oriented) in a way that discloses the possibilities of the present, concrete situation differently than they are to the inauthentic agent (SZ 302, 325–26).

Justin F. White

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

SZ 87, 191–94, 323–34; GA20:252–58, 424–32

FURTHER READING

Dreyfus 1991, 97, Käufer 2013, Keller 2000, chap. 6, Richardson 2012, chap. 4.

WHOOSHING UP (*AUFGANG*). SEE EMERGENCE.

WITH-WORLD (*MITWELT*). SEE BEING-WITH.

WITHHOLDING (*VORENTHALT*). SEE SOJOURN.

219.
WORLD (*WELT*)

THE WORLD IS the unfolding complex of actual and possible relationships that matter to human beings. In this complex of relationships, human beings essentially find and define themselves, others, and the things around them, while also being defined by the latter. The world is not to be confused with any entity or thing within it. Since taking something to be is typically construed as convertible with taking it to be an entity, Heidegger cautions against claiming that the world is. In order to ward off the possibility of construing the existence (the ontological status) of this complex with that of anything else (especially things, tools, objects within it as well as the subject-matters of any particular science), Heidegger early on coins the neologism "worlding" (*welten*), to which he frequently has recourse later (GA56/57:73; GA9:164/126; GA7:181/PLT 177; GA12:26/PLT 203; GA5:30f/22f; GA38:168/140). This verbalization of *Welt* is meant to indicate how the world distinctively moves or unfolds in a way that shapes and is shaped by the lived history of human existence. In *Being and Time* Heidegger introduces "being-in-the-world" as an operative metonym for "being-here" (*Dasein*) to capture this key understanding of the world.

In contrast to the kinds of physical occurrences investigated by natural scientists or the singular events chronicled by historians, the world is part and parcel of human existence as the underlying condition for those studies. For this very reason, the world's unfolding cannot be adequately described in their terms. So, too, the world is not to be confused with NATURE or with any mere collection of particular entities (GA29/30:504f.). It is instead the way that human beings exist, i.e., meaningfully and historically. To exist or, as Heidegger also puts it, to be here (*da*) is for me (the respective *me*) to be always already in a world, disclosing it in two coinciding (but hardly coincidental) senses. To exist is to project a complex of relationships on the basis of that complex into which I have been thrown, the complex in which I find myself – more or less attuned – from the outset. Again, in this process, the world coincides with the "thrown projection" that makes up my human historical existence or, in Heidegger's jargon, the being of DASEIN. As such, the world is ground zero for the analysis of human existence.

The world is thus not something that in any sense happens independent of human existence. It is not some superordinate being that, like the heavens above us, goes about its business, dwarfing us but also quite oblivious to us. To the contrary, there is only a world inasmuch as human beings form worlds. Yet a world is neither exhausted by our projections nor merely a useful placeholder for actual and possible relationships. Like being itself, the world is not any particular entity. Instead, it is an ongoing source of the meaning and content of entities. While traditional ontology is oriented to the meaning of "being" found in nature (hence, meta-physics), Heidegger aims to provide a fundamental ontology oriented to the SENSE of "being" that is characteristic of Dasein. Given the worldly character of Dasein, the problem of appropriately determining the sense of "being" becomes the problem of interpretation of the world. Accordingly, in 1928–29 Heidegger observes that "the problem of being unfolds into the

problem of the world, [and] the problem of the world bores into the problem of being – that is to say, both make up the inherently unified problematic of philosophy" (GA27:394).

A lifelong staple of Heidegger's philosophical vocabulary, the term "world" shifts, sometimes incrementally, sometimes dramatically, with changes in his thinking. What follows are glosses on five prominent – but by no means exhaustive – treatments of the concept in (a) Heidegger's early lectures, (b) *Being and Time*, (c) a key transitional essay and a lecture, both in 1929–30, (d) the essay on art and *Contributions to Philosophy* in the mid-1930s, and (e) his lectures and essays on the fourfold in the late 1940s and early 1950s.

1   WORLD, LIFE-WORLD, AND MEANING

In his first Freiburg lectures "world" and "worldly" are synonymous with "surrounding world" (*Umwelt*) and "the meaningful" (*Bedeutungshafte*). In these lectures he contrasts the theoretical attitude toward a subject-MATTER (*Sache*), rendering it as an object, with the LIVED EXPERIENCE of the surrounding world, where everything is "worldly," i.e., rife with meaning (GA56/57:73, 85, 89, 100, 112). The question of the existence of the external world (*Außenwelt*), directed at something that is experienced as part of the surrounding world is "an *absurd* question." "A theoretical question of the existence of my surrounding world … perverts its sense" (GA56/57:91).

Later in his early Freiburg lectures Heidegger introduces the notion of a life-world (*Lebenswelt*) which is "lived in a situation of the self" and thus encompasses the surrounding world, the world with others, and the world proper to a self (*Umwelt, Mit- und Selbst-Welt*) (GA58:45f., 59–64; GA61:94–98). In these lectures Heidegger analyzes the LIFE (*Leben*) of lived experience (*Erlebnis*), but it is always life in tandem with a world. Though the verb "live" is intransitive, it is typically explicated with the help of an array of propositions, e.g., living *in* something, *from* something, *with* something, *toward* something, etc. In a clear anticipation of the concept of being-in-the-world, he fixes on the "world" to designate that "something" related to living in the manifold ways expressed by these prepositions. Life is lived "in, out of, for, with, and against a world" such that the world provides the content of the sense of living. Life and world are not juxtaposed like two objects that exist on their own. Instead, "life" and "world" are metonyms, such that each word can represent the other in certain contexts. More precisely, "world is the basic category of the meaningful content in the phenomenon of life" (GA61:85ff., 98). The world is what we encounter and, as such, it is "here" (*da*). It is what we are concerned about, the source of meaningfulness. "Living in contexts of meaning, I experience the world. It announces itself as actual in those contexts" (GA58:107). The everyday world of this significance is the surrounding world (*Umwelt*) (GA63:85ff.). This insistence on the worldliness of human existence in these early lectures contrasts – at least prima facie – with Husserl's notion of an ultimately world-less transcendental subject, recognized via phenomenological reduction. "I am not the spectator and, by no means, the theorizing cognizer of myself and my life in the world" (GA58:39).

2   WORLD, WORLDLINESS, AND THE UNITY OF TIME'S HORIZONS

By the summer semester of 1925 Heidegger comes to regard his early conceptions of a world with others and a world proper to the self as "fundamentally false," since these conceptions

might wrongly suggest that the self and others have the sort of being that is proper to a world. To be sure, he continues to insist that, without a world, Dasein would no more be able to encounter itself and others than it does things and implements within its surrounding world. But when the world enables this encounter, it does so as the space in which Dasein pursues its concerns. The world in this sense is not to be confused with nature (at least as Descartes conceives it, repeating traditional ontology's perennial mistake), and the SPACE of this world is more original than any geometric space. It is rather the space of relevance or AFFORDANCE (*Bewandtnis*) and purposiveness (*Um-zu*) within which entities in the surrounding world are encountered. Heidegger introduces the concept of worldliness to underscore that the world is to be understood as central to the character of Dasein's being and only then (albeit simultaneously) that of other entities. Note that, as Heidegger distances himself from some of his early characterizations of the world, he retains the conception of the "surrounding world" (*Umwelt*) as the way the world is present in the context of our everyday COPING or dealings (*Umgang*) with things and, indeed, pre-eminently as a "work-world" (*Werkwelt*). These dealings suppose a basic meaningfulness that is precisely the basic structure of the world's being (worldliness) (GA20:226–31, 274–79, 286–92, 333f.).

Being-in-the-world is the center of gravity for the first part of the existential analysis in *Being and Time*, the effort to disclose the structures of everyday Dasein. As an initial step to unpacking what it means to be in the world, Heidegger differentiates four uses of the term "world": (1) the totality of entities on hand within the world, (2) the manner of being of entities on hand within the world (though the term can also designate a particular region of such entities, e.g., the world of mathematics), (3) the place in which, being-here (*da-seiend*), we factually live and dwell, including the public world and the world of a household, and (4) the manner of being proper to being-in-the-world. Uses (1) and (3) are "ontic," referring to different sorts of entities, coinciding roughly with non-human and human beings, respectively. Thus, in the first sense, "world" designates any collection of particular entities on hand within-the-world, while "world" in the third sense is existentiel, designating the place where Da-sein lives. By contrast, (2) and (4) are "ontological," referring to different manners of being, that of being on hand (i.e., OCCURRENT) within the world and that of being-in-the-world, respectively. As a means of differentiating these diverse meanings, Heidegger reserves the term "world" for (3), places the term in quotation marks when it designates (1), and substitutes the term "worldliness" for (4). As a result, he entitles the third chapter of *Being and Time* "The Worldliness of the World" and Section 21 "The Hermeneutic Discussion of the Cartesian Ontology of the 'World.'" Drawing heavily on discussions of the world in his early lectures (especially those in the summer of 1925), Heidegger contends that we can only have an adequate ontological understanding of the world by conceiving it in terms of the worldliness inherent to being-here (*Da-sein*), all the while taking our bearings from the world closest at hand to us everyday, namely, the surrounding world (*Umwelt*, SZ 64ff.).

In every encounter with something – whether an implement, product of nature, someone else, or ourselves – we take it for something (e.g., for hammering or writing), understanding it as such-and-such (e.g., a hammer or a pen). In this sense, the encounter "transcends" what is encountered. Heidegger contends that this transcending character is grounded in our TEMPORALITY. This contention turns on the fact that he construes our (Dasein's) temporality as inherently both ecstatic and horizonal. The term "ecstatic" is meant to capture how Dasein projects possibilities for itself, all the while coming back in some sense to itself (i.e., its

thrownness), and dwelling amidst things in the process (see Ecstasis). There are three distinct ecstatic characters here, each corresponding to a mode of TIME. Together, these ecstases make up the underlying future, past, and present that provide the meaning of our being. The future, Heidegger submits, is always dominant, and the temporality is authentic only in the authentic future, i.e., only when Dasein projects its ownmost possibility authentically.

Far from existing in a vacuum, each of these ecstatic characters has a horizon. Dasein projects possibilities for its own sake as the horizon of its future. It comes back to what it has been thrown into as the horizon of its having-been. It is alongside things for some intermediate purpose as the horizon of its present. These horizons, together with the ecstasies, form a unity. Thus, the way we are alongside things within the world (a way that it enables us to accomplish this or that) springs from the way that we project ourselves, each (pre-egoistically) for his own sake and, in the process, come back to our thrownness. In this way Heidegger signals the fundamentally temporal unity to what things are for, how Dasein comes to itself, projecting possibilities for its own sake, while all the while returning to its facticity, to its lot, to what has been left to it (SZ 365). This timely unity is "the condition of the possibility of being-in-the-world, in which the being of innerworldly entities is grounded" (SZ 351). What transcends particular entities is precisely the world, and its disclosure is also grounded in the temporality that is the sense of existence, our being-here. "Grounding [itself] in the horizonal unity of ecstatic temporality, the world is transcendent" (SZ 366). The TRANSCENDENCE of the world, so grounded, explains how entities can be encountered within the world and, in some instances, objectified (SZ 366).

3   GROUNDING AND FORMING THE WORLD

In *On the Essence of Ground* (1929), as in SZ, Heidegger understands the world in terms of being-in-the-world. Far from being itself an entity or the sum of entities, the world is that toward which the process of transcending entities is directed and for the sake of which the transcendence of being-in-the-world exists. Because the world is part of what makes up "the unified structure of transcendence" and thus belongs to it, the concept of world is "a *transcendental* concept," though he is quick to add that "transcendental" is not meant in an epistemological sense. The transcendental meaning of the concept of world is also distinct from its "pre-philosophical, vulgar meaning" as the universal set (*Allheit*), the indeterminate unity of everything. On this construal, everything is "in the world" and, in that sense, transcendent, nullifying the notion that transcendence and being-in-the-world are what essentially distinguishes "human Dasein." In other words, if "being-in-the-world" is rightly said exclusively of Dasein, then "world" means something other than the universal set of entities on hand (GA9:139ff./109ff.).

As a means of developing the transcendental sense of "world," Heidegger gives what he admits is a patchy overview of the history of the word's chief meanings. Yet the point of the exercise is to show that, for the most part, the vulgar meaning is not its original and essential meaning. Citing the pre-Socratics, he glosses the Greek sense of *kosmos*, signifying the condition of entities as a whole, i.e., how they are in a foregoing sense (*vorgängig*) that is nonetheless relative to Dasein. Christianity sharpens the concept of world, as its center of gravity shifts from the cosmic condition not simply to *ens creatum* but also to the human condition, i.e., to the way human beings position themselves toward the world (as *amatores mundi*). More specifically, the "world" for Christianity, both early and medieval, signifies both created beings as a whole and

a way of living among them, namely, enthralled by them rather than by God. Versions of these two senses – cosmological and existentiel conceptions of world ("unconditioned totality" and "the game of life," respectively) – also surface in Kant's philosophy but not, Heidegger stresses, as disjuncts. For Kant, as for the entire tradition, what is "metaphysically essential" to their conceptions of the world is the fact that it aims at "the interpretation of human Dasein *in its relation to entities as a whole*" – though this fact typically is only understood in a vague way (GA9:156/121).

The understanding of this totality, at once anticipatory and encompassing, is tantamount to climbing over things to the world (*Überstieg zur Welt*), but not as though entities are first on hand and we move past them to the world as another entity. Instead, the world is that for the sake of which Dasein meaningfully relates to any entity and becomes itself (a SELFHOOD, Heidegger adds, not to be confused with solipsism or egoism). The world, so conceived, not only is not itself an entity, but also coincides with selfhood, albeit neither as something merely subjective (i.e., falling within some inner sphere of "a 'subjective' subject") nor as something "merely objective" (i.e., one object among others). Dasein relates to entities as a whole, i.e., transcends (climbs over) them to the world, by projecting that world (*Weltentwurf*). Heidegger labels this process of transcendence and world-projection "world-forming" (*weltbildend*) (GA9:158/123). On the final pages of the essay, Heidegger combines these conceptions of world-projection and world-forming with different senses of grounding and their relation to FREEDOM.

The interpretation of Dasein as world-forming forms the basis for Heidegger's analysis of the concept of world as one of "the basic concepts of metaphysics," the title of lectures during the Winter Semester of 1929–30. Heidegger conducts the analysis through a comparison of world-forming human beings with "world-less" stones but especially (and, he admits, in the end misleadingly) with "world-poor" animals (GA29/30:261–64, 295–310). Continuing his refrain that the world is itself neither an entity nor a collection of entities, even entities as a whole, he urges that the world is the manifestness (*Offenbarkeit*) of entities as such (*Seiendes als solchem*). There is, to be sure, an openness (*Offensein*) that is characteristic of animals' instinctually driven behavior, whenever its surroundings remove any boundaries to (*enthemmen*) its exercise. But since the animal remains captivated by this interplay, its openness is not to be confused with the manifestness of entities that is inherent to a world.

> The animal has, to be sure, access to this or that, and, to be sure, to something that actually is – but that *only we* can experience and have manifest *as entities*. . . . We need to say: "world" signifies not accessibility to entities but, *among other things*, accessibility to entities *as such*. (GA29/30:390f.)

Strictly speaking, then, animals do not have a world, though they relate to "what, in *our* experience, is experienced as *entities*" (GA29/30:405). Heidegger acknowledges that these remarks are tentative if not tendentious, made as they are only from the perspective of the world-forming human being and from the unresolved metaphysical status of animals. Perhaps unsurprisingly, Heidegger later stresses that the animal does not have a world, not even an environment (GA29/30:393–96; GA40:48/47; GA65:276f.).

The contrast with animals is, nonetheless, the vehicle by which, in the 1929–30 lectures, Heidegger spells out certain characteristics of the world, not least its relation to what happens at a fundamental level (*Grundgeschehen*), i.e., the process of forming and projecting a world.

Neither entities as a whole nor access to them nor what underlies that access, the world is instead "the manifestness of entities as such as a whole" (GA29/30:413). This manifestness is pre-logical; that is to say, assertions (asserting what, how, and whether a particular being is) refer to it. Unlike animals, human beings are privy to this distinctive manifestness, that AS-STRUCTURE, and the corresponding whole precisely because, at a fundamental level of being-here (*Da-sein*), they are world-forming, projecting a world in which that manifestness – and with it, the difference between being and entities – takes place (GA29/30:495f., 509f., 526–31).

4 WORLD, EARTH, AND ART

In "The Origin of the Work of Art" (1935) the concept of world figures prominently in Heidegger's account of how the truth of the essences of things comes to light, encompassing both their unhiddenness and their hiddenness, in the artwork. Van Gogh's painting of the peasant woman's shoes, for example, brings to light their reliability, a reliability that gives the peasant woman's simple world its sheltered-ness (*Geborgenheit*), distinctive necessity, and proximity. To have a world is to stand in the openness of entities. While the peasant woman has a world, stones are world-less and even plants and animals, while having surroundings, lack a world in this sense (thereby further qualifying claims made in lectures a few years earlier). But artworks, too, have their worlds that can collapse or be withdrawn when they are installed in a museum – a collapse of a world and a withdrawal of a world that can never be undone (GA5:19f./14f., 26/19, 31/23).

Heidegger stresses this historical character of the world in the course of iterating that it is not a mere assemblage of things on hand or their imagined structure. "The *world worlds* and is more truly than all that is graspable and knowable in terms of which we believe ourselves to be at home" (GA5:30/23). Far from being an observable object that stands before us, the world is something ever non-objective (*das Ungegenständliche*) to which we are subject, as long as we exist and our historical fates remain in the balance. Indeed, it is the openness of the wide paths where the simple and essential decisions of our history (the decisions making up the destiny of a historical PEOPLE) are made. The world (this openness) opens itself and because it does, "all things have their ... distance and proximity" (GA5:31/23, 35/26).

The artwork sets up the world, keeping it open, but it does so by also placing the world back firmly on earth as something hidden and impenetrable. The artwork "moves the earth itself into the openness of a world and maintains it there" (GA5:29–32/21–24, 43/32). Yet the relation between world and earth is an opposition that is essential to both. As Heidegger puts it, "world and earth are essentially different from one another and yet never separated. The world grounds itself on the earth and the earth rages through the world" (GA5:35/26). The artwork instigates and sustains this strife (*Streit*) between the world's openness and the earth's hiddenness, transforming customary relations to earth and world in the process. "Truth essentially unfolds only as the strife between clearing and concealment, in the opposition of world and earth" (GA5:45/33; see, too, GA5:28–36/21–27, 50f./37f., 54/40).

In the late 1930s and early 1940s Heidegger continues to think of the world in its abiding, mutually sustaining confrontation with the earth, as the strife between them intersects with the confrontation of divinities and humans (GA65:280, 310; GA66:188; GA70:157). The strife of world and earth corresponds to truth as the sheltering, hidden clearing and, hence, also to the duality of beyng and entities (GA65:71f., 349, 354, 389ff.).

5 WORLD AND THE FOURFOLD

Just as the world plays a central role in determining respectively the "sense" and the "truth" of being in what Heidegger deems the first two major phases of his thinking, so it also figures prominently in what he considers the third phase, thinking the "place" of being. In the 1945 *Conversations on a Country Path* Heidegger contends that the world, insofar as it worlds, both gathers everything together and lets them return to themselves. As such, it is the nearness of the distant (and vice versa). The essence of THINKING – determined on the basis of relating to the world, so conceived – is the urgently needed composedness or equanimity of having been released to the world's worlding. Such thinking, not to be confused with presenting something or placing it before us (*vorstellen*), bears the relation through which human beings dwell in the nearness to the distant (GA77:148–51).

In his 1949 Bremen lectures Heidegger sheds some light on these enigmatic observations with a gloss on the world as the inexplicable and unfathomable play of the simple unfolding of the FOURFOLD (gods, humans, earth, and sky). Earth and sky, the divine and the mortal inhere in the simplicity of the fourfold. That simplicity is such that each of the four mirrors the others in the sense of freeing up, in its own way, the essence of the other three. Each of the fourfold is its own, but only in this mirroring or, equivalently, in the "play" of the fourfold where each is entrusted to the other. Heidegger calls this mirror-play of the fourfold's simplicity "the world," and then observes: "the world essentially unfolds in that it worlds. This is to say that the world's worlding can neither be explained through something else nor established [i.e., grounded] on the basis of something else" (GA79:19, 46). This inexplicableness, he adds, is not due to our human limitations but to the fact that anything like causes and grounds are unsuited to it. A causal explanation comes up short for two reasons: first, it must identify something outside the explanandum as the explanans and, second, it must construe the explanandum as something actual. In the case of the world's worlding, the former is an impossibility and the latter is a category mistake (everything actual falls under the essence of the world).

Further echoing themes of the *Country Path Conversation* Heidegger characterizes the world in terms of its relation to things and their nearness. The single dimension of the play of the fourfold is the nearing of the nearness of the world and things. "Only humans as mortals attain, in DWELLING, the world as world. Only what rings out from the world becomes sometimes a THING" (GA7:181–84/PLT 177–80). In the context of the fourfold, humans do not build a world as such, but rather the world includes them and emerges from how they dwell with things. To the extent that we safeguard things as things, we dwell in their nearness and the nearing of that nearness is "the genuine and only dimension of the mirror-play of the world" (GA79:20). So, too, as Heidegger puts it in the second Bremen lecture, "thinging is the nearing that holds the world as world in nearness" (GA79:24, 46). Things, their nearness, and the world are forfeited in the positionality (*Ge-stell*; see the INVENTORY, SYN-THETIC COM-POSIT(ION)ING) that lets whatever is present be present only as a component in the STANDING RESERVE. In other words, in the wholesale positioning of whatever is, things are neglected and the world is refused us (GA79:47). The world, by contrast, maintains the presence and absence of things in the fourfold and, as such, it is the truth of the essence of being. The characterization of the world in relation to being should not, Heidegger adds, be construed as though the world is a manner of being and beholden to it. Rather, the reverse is the case. "If the world does not explicitly first take place, being vanishes" (GA79:49).

The world and syn-thetic com-posit(ion)ing are opposed to one another, but in the same appropriating event or ADAPTATION. The world is the guardian (*Wahrnis*) of the essence of being, while positionality (the syn-thetic com-positioning of everything) goes hand-in-hand with an obliviousness to the truth of being, i.e., the world's worlding. That positionality obscures and distorts (*verstellt*) the nearness of the world, nearing us in the thing. It is precisely the world's hiddenness that secures the unhiddenness of the presence of things that are neglected in the dominance of positionality (the essence of modern technology). Thus, while the world's worlding is held back, this very event of positionality maintains a hidden distance from that worlding. If that obliviousness to the truth of being, mentioned above, turns back on itself and syn-thetic com-posit(ion)ing shows itself to be the DANGER, the world can flash onto the scene, allowing us to see what is happening (GA79:52f., 74–79).

Daniel Dahlstrom

REFERENCES IN HEIDEGGER

GA29/30:251–532

FURTHER READING

Dreyfus 1991, 88–107

220.
WORLDVIEW (*WELTANSCHAUUNG*)

I n ordinary parlance, a "worldview" is a fundamental and all-encompassing cognitive perspective on, or way of valuing or thinking about, the world. Heidegger understands worldview existentially – that is, as a modality of being-in-the-world, in which a particular stance (*Haltung*) or way of having a hold on the world predominates.

Weltanschauung literally means "intuition of world," but is commonly translated as "worldview." Heidegger, while critical of the term as it was used in his day, nonetheless gives it a positive meaning in his middle period.

Weltanschauung as a term is coined by Kant in the *Critique of the Power of Judgment*. In Kant, it addresses the problem of how reason is able to have an intuition of the totality of being. This is the concept of worldview which is capable of conceiving the infinity of the sensible world under one concept, to which there can be no sensible correspondence. In his own original way, Heidegger will recover this Kantian meaning in his own positive definition of the term. For the sake of simplicity, the English term "worldview" shall be used here, as its philosophical meaning is equally artificial in English as in the original German.

The term continues to be used by the German Idealists and other thinkers in the nineteenth century; however, it does not take on the specific meaning of the term to which Heidegger, among others, reacts, until the late nineteenth century. As of this time, the term takes on an ideological slant as in phrases such as "pessimistic" or "political worldview." As such, it signifies a people's or an individual's view of the world, including one's values and norms; *everybody* has a worldview of some sort.

In Dilthey, it takes on a negative meaning, as something to which philosophy, as a "doctrine of worldview" (*Weltanschauungs-Lehre*), can provide a positive solution. The problem with a worldview is that insofar as it is a radically subjective view of the world, the evidently existing, historically developed plurality of worldviews leads to a relativism of claims about the world. Obeying the fads and fashions of worldviews means kowtowing to a complete relativism. Philosophy has the role, once its transcendental claims have been overcome (as Dilthey believes he must, to further Kant's philosophy), of categorizing worldviews, effectively producing a typology of worldviews, distinguishing, e.g., between cultural, metaphysical, or psychological worldviews. This task can also be taken in a psychological manner, according to which a psychology of worldviews can trace the emergence of worldviews as anthropological constants (Jaspers). In this way, philosophy can anchor worldviews and can thereby help overcome this relativism. In fact, it is only a philosophical consideration of worldviews as indicated that can achieve this in the age of nihilism.

It is in this context that Heidegger steps in with his critical evaluation of the term. The point where he enters the debate is essentially whether or not philosophy has, or ought to have, any influence on the formation of worldviews. Is philosophy responsible for creating, or is it precisely its task to create, a philosophically justified or grounded worldview? Or is a worldview something over which philosophy has no influence and which is something that

is generated on its own and has its own originary right? Heidegger's tendency in answering these questions is critical of Dilthey's approach, similarly to the way in which he rejects the notion, inherited from Husserl, that philosophy should be a (rigorous) science. That philosophy should not engage in furnishing a worldview was a widespread sentiment among philosophers in the first decades of the twentieth century, and Heidegger's contribution to the debate is not particularly original. It is a sellout of philosophy both to provide a worldview or to model itself after science. In his mature phase, too, the discussion of worldview takes place in the context of philosophy vis-à-vis science and worldview.

In his early work, Heidegger is unambiguously critical of the term, in that even philosophy comes under the sway of having to produce a worldview that is to satisfy one's personal whim; and, a worldview merely follows this whim: "Today, worldview is tailored to 'life' rather than the other way around" (GA16:11/BH 14; 1911). In his earliest lectures in Freiburg of 1919, Heidegger argues for a radical incompatibility (*Unvereinbarkeit*) between philosophy and world-view. He goes so far as to say that the construction of a worldview must not be the task of philosophy, as especially the Southwest neo-Kantians claimed, but rather that it is a phenomenon alien to philosophy (*philosophiefremdes Phänomen*, GA56/57:12). This, in turn, motivates Heidegger's definition of philosophy as a "pre-theoretical primal science."

In *Being and Time*, the term crops up occasionally and with essentially the same negative connotation. What is emphasized here is the derived character of a worldview rather than being something originary. Indeed, only an existential anthropology in the way Heidegger envisions can provide a philosophically satisfying account of worldviews (cf. SZ 301). Both religious faith as well as "worldviews" can only take on their full signification when interpreted in the light of the existential analysis of Dasein (cf. SZ 180). Only an existential-ontological analysis of the sort *Being and Time* provides can interpret worldviews as what they truly are: essential expressions of existential possibilities of Dasein.

The most sustained treatment of the term can be found in Heidegger's lecture course of 1928–29, *Einleitung in die Philosophie*, Heidegger's first semester after his return from Marburg. Here, too, Heidegger demarcates philosophy from both science and worldview. In section two, dedicated to the discussion of the relation between philosophy and worldview, Heidegger gives a detailed definition of worldview, beginning from its historical and linguistic origin. A worldview is preliminarily defined as a form of position-taking (*Stellungnahme*) of one's own convictions (GA27:233), whether these are actively taken or passively taken over from one's tradition. In this sense, having an *Anschauung* is synonymous to having an *Ansicht*, a view, as in the phrase "I am of the view" (*ich bin der Ansicht*). As such, it signals a certain stance or attitude (*Haltung* – literally "holding") of Dasein (GA27:233). From here, Heidegger goes on to develop an existential interpretation of worldview. Worldview is now defined as one mode of being-in-the-world, whose essential character is transcendence, "which is essentially deter-mined by having-no-hold [*Halt-losigkeit*]. Transcendence – freedom!" (GA27:341). This hav-ing-no-hold, which is the condition for us to be free, is an essential or "metaphysical" structure of Dasein (GA27:341f.). It is in this sense that Dasein looks ahead at "Dasein as a whole" (*Dasein im Ganzen*), which recaptures the sense of wholeness of world in the original Kantian sense, which Heidegger discusses earlier in the lecture in detail (GA27:248–304).

Once this definition has been reached, Heidegger discusses different forms of worldview that are derivative of this existential meaning. Sheltering (*Bergung*) is an inauthentic or degenerate stance (*Haltung*). The authentic form of stance is nothing other than philosophy itself.

Mythical existence is a form of worldview, in which Dasein experiences itself as having a certain "nestedness" (*Bergung*) within omnipotent being. In this respect, Heidegger acknowledges the work on "mythical thought" by Cassirer, while objecting to its lack of an existential dimension (GA27:357–62).

A "degenerate" manner of sheltering (*Bergung*) is the worldview of the modern business (*Betrieb*). It no longer provides a sense of comfort or security (*Geborgenheit*), but manifests itself in forming institutions of POWER, in which the need for comfort has been shunned. This creates an "inner emptiness of Dasein" (GA27:364), in which Dasein, rather than finding a new sense of comfort, loses itself. Once this stage has been reached, the need for worldviews (in the negative sense) arises, which are made to fit superficial needs. These analyses anticipate Heidegger's later critique of technology.

In contrast to these, Heidegger returns to what is presumably an authentic form of having a worldview via the concept of a stance (*Haltung*). Heidegger defines the relation between philosophy and worldview in that philosophy is itself a stance in a special sense as it is "explicit transcending" (GA27:378). In this respect, philosophy is worldview par excellence. It is not that worldview is the condition of the possibility of philosophy or vice versa, but rather "philosophy 'is' worldview. Because philosophy necessarily is worldview . . . it can for that reason not be the task and goal of philosophy to furnish [*ausbilden*] a worldview" (GA27:379). It is rather a stance in the original Greek sense of *ethos*, which is more originary than a positive "ethics" but an original stance toward being as a whole, without wanting to dominate or subject entities (as in degenerate sheltering). Thus, "with worldview as stance philosophizing occurs [*geschieht*]" (386), which is nothing other than the awakening of the problem of being. Only this sense of worldview is the basis upon which an explicit investigation of special regions and types of being – science, in other words – can arise.

This is the last time in his career that Heidegger will make a positive attempt to define worldview in the framework of his existential ontology, prior to the TURN (*Kehre*). After his turning to being-historical (*seinsgeschichtlich*) thinking, Heidegger sees having an image or a picture of the world (*Weltbild* is the term he uses there, though he might as well have used "worldview," *Weltanschauung*) as indicative of a historical epoch, namely that of modernity. In his essay "The Age of the World Picture" of 1938, having a "world picture" is a sign of the technological mastery over the world that the West has engendered in modernity. Whether the positive account given a decade earlier is still valid given its later placement in a historical setting, remains unanswered.

Sebastian Luft

German–English Glossary

Abbau	Deconstruction. See "Destruction" entry
Abgrund	Abyss
Alltäglichkeit	Everydayness
Als-Struktur	As-Structure
Anfang	Inception
Angst	Anxiety
Anklang	Resonating
Anschauung	Intuition
Anwesen	Presencing
Anzeige	Formal indication
Apperzeption	Apperception
Artikulation	Articulation
Aufenthalt	Sojourn
Aufgang	Emergence
Augenblick	Moment
Ausdrücken	Express
Ausdrücklich	Express
Auseinandersetzung	Confrontation
Auslegung	Interpretation
Aussage	Assertion
Austrag	Disposition
Bauen	Building
Bedeutung	Meaning
Befindlichkeit	Disposedness
Begriff	Concept
Besinnen	Consider. See "Reflection" entry
Bestand	Standing reserve
Bewandtnis	Affordance
Bewegung	Movement
Bewusstsein	Consciousness
Beziehung	Relation
Da	There
Dasein	Dasein
Denken	Thinking
Destruktion	Destruction
Dichtung	Poetry
Ding	Thing
Durchschnittlichkeit	Averageness
Durchsichtigkeit	Transparency
Eigentlichkeit	Authenticity
Einbildung	Imagination
Einebnen	Leveling
Ek-sistenz	Ek-sistence
Ekstase	Ecstasis
Ende	End

Endlichkeit	Finitude
Entschlossenheit	Resoluteness
Entsprechung	Correspondence
Epoché	Epoché
Erbe	Heritage
Erde	Earth
Ereignis	Adaptation
Erfahrung	Experience
Erinnerung	Remembrance
Erkenntnis	Cognition
Erlebnis	Lived Experience
Erscheinung	Appearance
Erschlossenheit	Disclosedness
Erwartung	Expecting
Existenz	Existence
Existenzial	Existential
Existenziell	Existentiell. See "Existential" entry
Faktizität	Facticity
Freiheit	Freedom
Fug	Fittingness
Funktion	Function
Furcht	Fear. See "Anxiety" entry
Ganze	Whole
Gefahr	Danger
Gegebenheit	Givenness
Gegenstand	Object
Geheimnis	Mystery
Geist	Spirit
Gelassenheit	Releasement
Gerechtigkeit	Justice
Gerede	Idle Talk
Geschichte	History
Geschichte des Seins	History of being
Geschick	Destiny
Ge-Stell	Inventory or syn-thetic com-posit(ion)ing
Geviert	Fourfold
Gewärtigen	Awaiting
Gewissen	Conscience
Gewissheit	Certainty
Geworfenheit	Thrownness
Gleichursprünglichkeit	Equiprimordiality
Gliederung	Jointedness
Gott	God
Götter	Gods. See "God or Gods" entry
Grenze	Boundary
Gut, das	The good
Heilige, das	The holy
Heimkehr	Homecoming
Hermeneutik	Hermeneutics
Horizont	Horizon
Identität	Identity
In-der-Welt-sein	Being-in-the-world
Innerweltlichkeit	Being-within-the-world. See "World" entry

Innigkeit	Intimacy
Inständigkeit	Steadfastness
Intentionalität	Intentionality
Irre	Errancy
Jemeinigkeit	Mineness
Kampf	Struggle. See "*Polemos*" entry
Kehre	Turn
Konstitution	Constitution
Kunst	Art
Lage	Situation
Langeweile	Boredom
Leben	Life
Leib	Lived body
Leibhaftigkeit	Bodily presence. See "Lived body" entry
Lichtung	Clearing
Logik	Logic
Machenschaft	Machination
Macht	Power
Man, das	The anyone
Mensch	Human being
Metaphysik	Metaphysics
Mitdasein	Co-existence. See "Being-with" entry
Miteinandersein	Being-with-one-another. See "Being-with" entry
Mitteilung	Communication
Mitwelt	Shared world. See "Being-with" entry
Möglichkeit	Possibility
Mythos	Myth
Nähe	Closeness
Näherung	Bringing close by. See "Closeness" entry
Natur	Nature
Neugier	Curiosity
Neuzeit	Modernity
Nichts	Nothing
Nihilismus	Nihilism
Nivellieren	Leveling
Objekt	Object
Offene	Open
Öffentlichkeit	Publicness
Ontisch	Ontic
Ontologie	Ontology
Onto-theo-logie	Onto-theo-logy
Ort	Place
Ortschaft	Place
Phänomenologie	Phenomenology
Raum	Space
Realität	Reality
Rede	Discourse
Riesige	Gigantic
Riß	Rift
Sache	the Matter
Sammlung	Gathering
Satz	Principle
Schein	Seeming

Schritt zurück	Step back
Schuld	Guilt
Schwingung	Oscillation
Seiendheit	Beingness
Sein	Being
Seinkönnen	Ability-to-be
Seinsvergessenheit	Forgetfulness of being
Seinsverlassenheit	Abandonment of being
Selbstheit	Selfhood
Seyn	Beyng
Sinn	Sense
Situation	Situation
Sorge	Care
Sprache	Language
Springen	Leap
Ständigkeit	Constancy
Stätte	Site
Stehen	Stand
Stimmung	Mood
Streit	Strife. See "*Polemos*" entry
Struktur	Structure
Subjekt	Subject
Subjektivität	Subjectivity. See "Subject" entry
Technik	Technology
Temporalität	Temporality
Thematisch	Thematic
Tod	Death
Topologie	Topology
Transzendenz	Transcendence
Übergang	Transition
Übersetzung	Translation
Überwindung	Overcoming
Umgang	Coping
Umsicht	Circumspection
Unheimlichkeit	Uncanniness
Unterscheidung	Difference
Unverborgenheit	Unconcealment
Vereinzelung	Individualization
Verfallen	Falling
Verfassung	Constitution
Verhaltenheit	Restraint
Verhaltung	Comportment
Verstehen	Understanding
Verweisung	Reference
Volk	People
Vollzug	Actualization
Vorhandenheit	Occurrentness
Vorstellung	Representation
Vor-Struktur	Fore-structure
Wahrheit	Truth
Wahrnehmung	Perception
Walten	Prevailing
Weg	Way

Weilen	Lingering
Welt	World
Weltanschauung	Worldview
Wert	Value
Wesen	Essence
Wiederholung	Repetition
Wink	Hint
Wirklichkeit	Actuality
Wissenschaft	Science
Wohnen	Dwelling
Woraufhin	In-terms-of-which
Worumwillen	For-the-sake-of-which
Zauber	Enchantment
Zeichen	Signs
Zeigen	Showing
Zeit	Time
Zeitlichkeit	Temporality
Zerstörung	Destruction
Zerstreuung	Dispersion
Zeug	Equipment
Zuhandenheit	Availableness
Zunächst und zumeist	Proximally and for the most part
Zusammenhang	Context
Zuspiel	Playing forth
Zwischen	Between

Bibliography

Adorno, Theodor W. 1992. "Parataxis: On Hölderlin's Late Poetry." In his *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. 11: *Notes to Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press), 109–49.

Adrián Escudero, Jesús. 2009. *El lenguaje de Heidegger: Diccionario filosófico 1912–1927* (Barcelona: Herder).

2013. "Heidegger on Discourse and Idle Talk: The Role of Aristotelian Rhetoric," *Gatherings: The Heidegger Circle Annual* 3: 1–17.

2015. *Heidegger and the Emergence of the Question of Being*, trans. Juan Pablo Hernández Betancur (London: Bloomsbury).

Ahmed, Sara. 2007. "A Phenomenology of Whiteness," *Feminist Theory* 8/2: 149–68.

Apel, Karl-Otto. 1963. *Die Idee der Sprache in der Tradition des Humanismus von Dante bis Vico*, Archiv für Begriffsgeschichte 8 (Bonn: Bouvier).

Arisaka, Yoko. 1995. "On Heidegger's Theory of Space: A Critique of Dreyfus," *Inquiry* 38: 455–67.

Arjakovsky, Philippe, François Fédier, and Hadrien France-Lanord (eds.). 2013. *Le dictionnaire Martin Heidegger* (Paris: Éditions du Cerf).

Arrien, Sophie-Jan. 2014. *L'inquiétude de la pensée: L'herméneutique de la vie du jeune Heidegger (1919–1923)* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France).

Asana Kalinga Maidika, Jules. 2013. *Métaphysique et technique moderne chez Martin Heidegger* (Paris: L'Harmattan).

Aurenque, Diana. 2011. *Ethosdenken: Auf der Spur einer ethischen Fragestellung in der Philosophie Martin Heideggers* (Freiburg: Karl Alber).

Backman, Jussi. 2006. "Divine and Mortal Motivation: On the Movement of Life in Aristotle and Heidegger," *Continental Philosophy Review* 38/3: 241–61.

2015. *Complicated Presence: Heidegger and the Postmetaphysical Unity of Being* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

Bambach, Charles. 1995. *Heidegger, Dilthey, and the Crisis of Historicism* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

2003. *Heidegger's Roots: Nietzsche, National Socialism and the Greeks* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

2013. *Thinking the Poetic Measure of Justice: Hölderlin-Heidegger-Celan* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

Barthes, Roland. 1975. *The Pleasure of the Text*, trans. Richard Miller (New York: Hill & Wang).

Bauer, Nancy. 2001. "Being-With as Being-Against: Heidegger Meets Hegel in *The Second Sex*," *Continental Philosophy Review* 34: 129–49.

Beauvoir, Simone de. 1949. *Le deuxième sexe* (Paris: Gallimard).

1953. *The Second Sex*, trans. H.M. Parshley (New York: Alfred A. Knopf).

Bell, Jeffrey A., Andrew Cutrofello, and Paul M. Livingston (eds.). 2015. *Beyond the Analytic-Continental Divide: Pluralist Philosophy in the Twenty-First Century* (London: Routledge).

Bernasconi, Robert. 1985. *The Question of Language in Heidegger's History of Being* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press).

1987. "Descartes in the History of Being," *Research in Phenomenology* 17: 75–102.

1990. "Heidegger's Destruction of Phronesis," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 28 (S1): 127–47.

1994. "Repetition and Tradition: Heidegger's Destructuring of the Distinction Between Essence and Existence in *Basic Problems of Phenomenology*," in Theodore Kisiel and Jan van Buren (eds.), *Reading Heidegger From the Start: Essays in his Earliest Thought* (Albany: State University of New York Press), 123–36.

2012. "Heidegger, Rickert, Nietzsche and the Critique of Biologism," in Babette Babich, Alfred Denker, and Holger Zaborowski (eds.), *Heidegger & Nietzsche* (Amsterdam: Rodopi), 158–80.

2013a. "Heidegger, Nietzsche, National Socialism," in François Raffoul and Eric S. Nelson (eds.), *The Bloomsbury Companion to Heidegger* (New York: Bloomsbury), 47–54.

2013b. "Who Belongs? Heidegger's Philosophy of the *Volk* in 1933–34," in Gregory Fried and Richard Polt (eds.), *Martin Heidegger: Nature, History, State* (London: Bloomsbury), 109–25.

Bernet, Rudolf. 1994a. "Phenomenological Reduction and the Double Life of the Subject," in Theodore Kisiel and Jan van Buren (eds.), *Reading Heidegger from the Start: Essays in his Earliest Thought* (Albany: State University of New York Press), 245–67.

1994b. *La vie du sujet: Recherches sur l'interprétation de Husserl dans la phénoménologie* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France).

Bernstein, Richard J. 1991a. *The New Constellation: The Ethical-Political Horizons of Modernity/Postmodernity* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

1991b. "Heidegger's Silence? Ēthos and Technology," in Bernstein 1991a, 79–141.

Blattner, William. 1994. "The Concept of Death in *Being and Time*," *Man and World* 27: 49–70.

1996. "Existence and Self-Understanding in *Being and Time*," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 56: 97–110.

1999. *Heidegger's Temporal Idealism* (Cambridge University Press).

2005. "Temporality," in Dreyfus and Wrathall 2005, 311–34.

2006. *Heidegger's Being and Time: A Reader's Guide*. London: Continuum.

2007. "Ontology, the A Priori, and the Primacy of Practice," in Crowell and Malpas 2007, 10–27.

2013. "Authenticity and Resoluteness," in Wrathall 2013a, 320–37.

2015. "Essential Guilt and Transcendental Conscience," in McManus 2015c, 116–34.

Borgmann, Albert. 1984. *Technology and the Character of Contemporary Life: A Philosophical Inquiry* (University of Chicago Press).

Brandom, Robert. 2002a. "Dasein, the Being that Thematizes," in his *Tales of the Mighty Dead: Historical Essays in the Metaphysics of Intentionality* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), 324–47.

2002b. "Heidegger's Categories in *Sein und Zeit*," in his *Tales of the Mighty Dead: Historical Essays in the Metaphysics of Intentionality* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), 298–323.

Braver, Lee. 2007. *A Thing of this World: A History of Continental Anti-Realism* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press).

2012. *Groundless Grounds: A Study of Wittgenstein and Heidegger* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

(ed.). 2015. *Division III of Heidegger's Being and Time: The Unanswered Question of Being* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

Brentano, Franz. 1973. *Psychology from an Empirical Standpoint*, trans. Antos C. Rancurello, D.B. Terrell, and Linda McAlister (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul; 1st German ed. 1874).

Brewer, Bill. 2006. "Perception and Content," *European Journal of Philosophy* 14: 165–81.

Brogan, Walter. 2005. *Heidegger and Aristotle: The Twofoldness of Being* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

Bucher, Theodor. 2006–07. "Zu Heideggers Verständnis der formalen Logik," *Heidegger Studies* 22: 111–45 and 23: 113–46.

Burch, Matthew I. 2013. "The Existential Sources of Phenomenology: Heidegger on Formal Indication," *European Journal of Philosophy* 21: 258–78.

Burkert, Walter. 1985. *Greek Religion*, trans. John Raffan (Oxford: Blackwell).

Campbell, Scott M. 2012. *Early Heidegger's Philosophy of Life: Facticity, Being, and Language* (New York: Fordham University Press).

Capobianco, Richard. 2010. *Engaging Heidegger* (University of Toronto Press).

2014. *Heidegger's Way of Being* (University of Toronto Press).

Caputo, John D. 1992. "Spirit and Danger," in Arleen B. Dallery *et al.* (eds.), *Ethics and Danger: Essays on Heidegger and Continental Thought* (Albany: State University of New York Press), 43–59.

1993. *Demythologizing Heidegger* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Caputo, John D. and Michael J. Scanlon (eds.). 1999. *God, the Gift, and Postmodernism* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Carlisle, Clare. 2011. "Repetition and Recurrence: Putting Metaphysics in Motion," in Alison Stone (ed.), *The Edinburgh Critical History of Philosophy* (Edinburgh University Press), 294–313.

2013. "Kierkegaard and Heidegger," in J. Lippitt and G. Pattison (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Kierkegaard* (Oxford University Press), 421–39.

Carman, Taylor. 1991. "The Conspicuousness of Signs in *Being and Time*," *Journal of the British Society of Phenomenology* 22: 158–69.

1994. "On Being Social: A Reply to Olafson," *Inquiry* 37: 203–23.

1995. "Heidegger's Concept of Presence," *Inquiry* 38: 431–53.

2003. *Heidegger's Analytic: Interpretation, Discourse, and Authenticity in Being and Time* (Cambridge University Press).

2005. "Authenticity," in Dreyfus and Wrathall 2005, 285–96.

2015. "Heidegger on Unconcealment and Correctness," in S. Gardner and M. Grist (eds.), *The Transcendental Turn* (Oxford University Press), 264–77.

Carnap, Rudolf. 1931. "Überwindung der Metaphysik durch logische Analyse der Sprache," *Erkenntnis* 2: 219–41.

1959. "The Elimination of Metaphysics through Logical Analysis of Language," in A. J. Ayer (ed.), *Logical Positivism* (New York: Free Press; 1st German ed. 1931), 60–81.

Carr, David. 2007. "Heidegger on Kant on Transcendence," in Crowell and Malpas 2007, 28–42.

Carter, James. 2014. "Heidegger's Sein zum Tode as Radicalization of Aristotle's Definition of Kinesis," *Epoché: A Journal for the History of Philosophy* 18: 473–502.

Casey, Edward S. 1997. *The Fate of Place: A Philosophical History*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cassirer, Ernst. 1910. *Substanzbegriff und Funktionsbegriff* (Berlin: B. Cassirer).

1965. *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms*, VOL. II: *Mythical Thought*, trans. Ralph Manheim (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).

Cattin, Emmanuel Sérenité. 2012. *Eckhart, Schelling, Heidegger* (Paris: Vrin).

Cavell, Stanley. 1989. *This New Yet Unapproachable America* (Albuquerque, NM: Living Batch Press).

Cerbone, David R. 1999. "Composition and Constitution: Heidegger's Hammer," *Philosophical Topics* 27: 309–29.

Ciocan, Cristian. 2011. "Comprendre et sens: La genèse ontologique du langage dans l'analytique du Dasein," *Revue philosophique de Louvain* 109: 527–51.

Cioflec, Eveline. 2012. *Der Begriff des 'Zwischen' bei Martin Heidegger* (Freiburg: Karl Alber).

Clark, Maudemarie. 1998. "Nietzsche," in Edward Craig (ed.), *The Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, vol. VI (New York: Routledge), 844–61.

Comay, Rebecca and John McCumber (eds.). 2009. *Endings: Questions of Memory in Hegel and Heidegger* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press).

Conway, Daniel. 1992. "Heidegger, Nietzsche, and the Origins of Nihilism," *Journal of Nietzsche Studies* 3: 11–43.

Critchley, Simon. 2004. *Very Little . . . Almost Nothing*, rev. ed. (London: Routledge).

Crowe, Benjamin D. 2001. "Resoluteness in the Middle Voice," *Philosophy Today* 45: 225–41.

2006. *Heidegger's Religious Origins: Destruction and Authenticity* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Crowell, Steven. 2001a. *Husserl, Heidegger, and the Space of Meaning* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press).

2001b. "Subjectivity: Locating the First-Person in Being and Time," *Inquiry* 44: 433–54.

2007. "Sorge or Selbstbewußtsein? Heidegger and Korsgaard on the Sources of Normativity," *European Journal of Philosophy* 15: 315–33.

2013. *Normativity and Phenomenology in Husserl and Heidegger* (Cambridge University Press).

Crowell, Steven and Jeff Malpas (eds.). 2007. *Transcendental Heidegger* (Stanford University Press).

Dahlstrom, Daniel O. 1991. "Heidegger's Kantian Turn: Notes to his Commentary on the *Kritik der Reinen Vernunft*," *Review of Metaphysics* 45/2: 329–61.

1994. "Heidegger's Method: Philosophical Concepts as Formal Indications," *Review of Metaphysics* 47: 775–97.

1995. "Heidegger's Concept of Temporality: Reflections on a Recent Criticism," *Review of Metaphysics* 49: 95–115.

2000. "Heidegger's Deliberations," *Research in Phenomenology* 1: 254–59.

2001. *Heidegger's Concept of Truth*. (Cambridge University Press).

2007. "Transcendental Truth and the Truth that Prevails," in Crowell and Malpas 2007, 63–73.

2010. "The *Critique of Pure Reason* and Continental Philosophy: Heidegger's Interpretation of Transcendental Imagination," in Paul Guyer (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason* (Cambridge University Press), 380–400.

2013a. "The Opening of the Future," *South African Journal of Philosophy* 32: 373–82.

2013b. *The Heidegger Dictionary* (London: Bloomsbury).

2015. "The End of Fundamental Ontology," in Braver 2015, 83–103.

2017. "Rethinking Difference," in Holger Zaborowski (ed.), *Heidegger's Question of Being: Dasein, Truth, and History* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press), 8–25.

Dallmayr, Fred. 1986. "Heidegger, Hölderlin, and Politics," *Heidegger Studies* 2: 81–95.

2001. "Heidegger on Macht and Machenschaft," *Continental Philosophy Review* 34/3: 247–67.

Dastur, Françoise. 1987. "Logic and Ontology: Heidegger's 'Destruction' of Logic," *Research in Phenomenology* 17/1: 55–74.

1990. *Heidegger et la question du temps* (Paris: Presses universitaires de France).

1999. *Heidegger and the Question of Time*, trans. François Raffoul and David Pettigrew (Amherst, NY: Humanity Books).

Davis, Bret W. 2007. *Heidegger and the Will: On the Way to Gelassenheit* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press).

2014a. "Heidegger on Christianity and Divinity: A Chronological Compendium," in Davis 2014b, 231–59.

(ed.). 2014b. *Martin Heidegger: Key Concepts* (New York: Routledge).

De Beistegui, Miguel. 2000. "Boredom: Between Existence and History: On Heidegger's Pivotal *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*," *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 31/2: 145–58.

Declève, Henri. 1970. *Heidegger et Kant*, Phaenomenologica 40 (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff).

Denker, Alfred. 2000. *Historical Dictionary of Heidegger's Philosophy* (London: Scarecow Press).

2013. "*Being and Time*: A Carefully Planned Accident?" in Wrathall 2013a, 157–76.

Denker, Alfred and Holger Zaborowski (eds.). 2006. *Heidegger und die Logik* (Amsterdam: Rodopi).

Derrida, Jacques. 1978a. "Violence and Metaphysics: An Essay on the Thought of Emmanuel Levinas," in his *Writing and Difference*, trans. Alan Bass (University of Chicago Press, 1978; 1st French ed. 1967), 97–192.

1978b. *Writing and Difference*, trans. Alan Bass (University of Chicago Press).

1985. "Letter to a Japanese Friend," in David Wood and Robert Bernasconi (eds.), *Derrida and Difference* (Warwick: Parousia Press), 1–5.

1987. *The Truth in Painting* (University of Chicago Press).

1989. *Of Spirit*, trans. Geoffrey Bennington and Rachel Bowlby (University of Chicago Press).

1992a. "How to Avoid Speaking: Denials," in Harold Coward and Toby Foshay (eds.), *Derrida and Negative Theology* (Albany: State University of New York Press), 73–142.

1992b. "Postscriptum: Aporias, Ways and Voices," in Harold Coward and Toby Foshay (eds.), *Derrida and Negative Theology* (Albany: State University of New York Press), 283–323.

1993. "Heidegger's Ear: Philopolemology (Geschlecht 4)," in John Sallis (ed.), *Reading Heidegger: Commemorations* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), 163–218.

1997. *Of Grammatology*, corrected ed., trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press).

2001. "Geschlecht: Sexual Difference, Ontological Difference," in Nancy J. Holland and Patricia Huntington (eds.), *Feminist Interpretations of Martin Heidegger* (Pennsylvania State University Press), 53–72.

2008. *The Animal that Therefore I Am*. New York: Fordham University Press.

2011. *The Beast and the Sovereign*, vol. 11, trans. Geoffrey Bennington (University of Chicago Press).

Dewalque, Arnaud. 2005. "La critique de la théorie des valeurs dans 'L'origine de l'œuvre d'art': Contributions à une confrontation entre Rickert et Heidegger," *Revue Philosophique de Louvain* 103/3: 390–414.

De Warren, Nicolas and Andrea Staiti (eds.). 2015. *New Approaches to Neo-Kantianism* (Cambridge University Press).

Di Cesare, Donatella. 2015. *Heidegger, die Juden, die Shoah* (Frankfurt: Klostermann).

Dilthey, Wilhelm. 1906. *Das Erlebnis und die Dichtung: Lessing, Goethe, Novalis* (Leipzig: B.G. Teubner).

Dreyfus, Hubert L. 1980. "Holism and Hermeneutics," *Review of Metaphysics* 34: 3–23.

   1991. *Being-in-the-World: A Commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time Division I* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

   1992. *What Computers Still Can't Do: A Critique of Artificial Reason* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

   1995. "Interpreting Heidegger on *Das Man*," *Inquiry* 38/4: 423–30.

   1997. "Heidegger on Gaining a Free Relation to Technology," in Kristin Shrader-Frechette and Laura Westra (eds.), *Technology and Values* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield), 41–54.

   2000. "Could Anything be More Intelligible than Everyday Intelligibility? Reinterpreting Division I of *Being and Time* in the light of Division II," in James E. Faulconer and Mark A. Wrathall (eds.), *Appropriating Heidegger* (Cambridge University Press), 155–74.

   2005a. "Foreword" to Carol J. White, *Time and Death: Heidegger's Analysis of Finitude*, ed. Mark Ralkowski (Aldershot: Ashgate).

   2005b. "Heidegger's Ontology of Art," in Dreyfus and Wrathall 2005, 407–19.

   2006. "Heidegger on the Connection Between Nihilism, Art, Technology, and Politics," in Guignon 2006b, 345–72.

   2014. "Heidegger's Critique of the Husserl/Searle Account of Intentionality," in Mark A. Wrathall (ed.), *Skillful Coping* (Oxford University Press), 76–91.

   2017a. *Background Practices: Essays on the Understanding of Being* (Oxford University Press).

   2017b. "Heidegger's Ontology of Art," in his *Background Practices* (Oxford University Press).

Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Sean Kelly. 2011. *All Things Shining* (New York: Free Press).

Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Charles Spinosa. 1997. "Highway Bridges and Feasts: Heidegger and Borgmann on how to Affirm Technology," *Man and World* 30: 159–77.

Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Charles Taylor. 2015. *Retrieving Realism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Dreyfus, Hubert L. and Mark A. Wrathall (eds.). 2005. *A Companion to Heidegger* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Düttmann, Alexander García. 2002. *The Memory of Thought: An Essay on Heidegger and Adorno*, trans. Nicholas Walker (London: Continuum).

Edwards, James C. 1997. *The Plain Sense of Things: The Fate of Religion in an Age of Normal Nihilism* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press).

Eichinger, Ludwig M., Meike Meliss, and María José Domínguez Vázquez (eds.). 1982. *Tendenzen verbaler Wortbildung in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache* (Hamburg: Buske).

Elden, Stuart. 2002. *Mapping the Present: Heidegger, Foucault and the Project of a Spatial History* (London: Bloomsbury).

   2006. *Speaking Against Number: Heidegger, Language and the Politics of Calculation* (Edinburgh University Press).

Elliott, Brian. 2005. *Phenomenology and Imagination in Husserl and Heidegger* (New York: Routledge).

Elpidorou, Andreas and Lauren Freeman. 2015. "Affectivity in Heidegger I: Moods and Emotions in *Being and Time*," *Philosophy Compass* 10: 661–71.

Elsen, Hilke. 2011. *Grundzüge der Morphologie des Deutschen* (Berlin: de Gruyter).

Emad, Parvis. 1981a. *Heidegger and the Phenomenology of Value* (Glen Ellyn, IL: Torey Press).

   1981b. "Heidegger on Transcendence and Intentionality: His Critique of Scheler," in Thomas Sheehan (ed.), *Heidegger: The Man and the Thinker* (Chicago, IL: Precedent), 145–58.

Eriksen, Niels Nymann. 2000. *Kierkegaard's Category of Repetition: A Reconstruction* (Berlin: de Gruyter).

Espinet, David. 2016. *Phänomenologie des Hörens: Eine Untersuchung im Ausgang von Martin Heidegger*, 2nd ed. (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Fabris, A. 1997. "L'ermeneutica della fatticità nei corsi friburghesi dal 1919 al 1923," in F. Volpi (ed.), *Heidegger* (Rome: Laterza), 57–106.

Farin, Ingo. 2015. "Heidegger: Transformation of Hermeneutics," in Jeff Malpas and Hans-Helmuth Gander (eds.), *The Routledge Companion to Hermeneutics* (New York: Routledge), 107–26.

Farin, Ingo and Jeff Malpas. 2016. *Reading Heidegger's Black Notebooks 1931–1941* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

Feick, Hildegaard and Susanne Ziegler. 1991. *Index zu Heidegger's Sein und Zeit*, 4th rev. ed. (Tübingen: Niemeyer; 1st ed. 1961).

Fell, Joseph P. 1979. *Heidegger and Sartre: An Essay on Being and Place* (New York: Columbia University Press).

   1992. "The Familiar and the Strange: On the Limits of Praxis in Early Heidegger," in Hubert L. Dreyfus and Harrison Hall (eds.), *Heidegger: A Critical Reader* (Oxford: Blackwell), 65–80.

Figal, Günter. 2006. "Heidegger's Philosophy of Language in an Aristotelian Context: dunamis meta logou," in Drew A. Hyland and John Panteleimon Manoussakis (eds.), *Heidegger and the Greeks: Interpretive Essays* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), 83–92.

   2010a. *Objectivity: The Hermeneutical and Philosophy*, trans. Theodore D. George (Albany: State University of New York Press).

   2010b. "Phenomenology: Heidegger after Husserl and the Greeks," in Davis 2014b, 33–43.

Figal, Günter and Hans-Helmuth Gander. 2005. *Dimensionen des Hermeneutischen* (Frankfurt: Klostermann).

Fleischer, Margot. 1991. *Die Zeitanalysen in Heideggers Sein und Zeit* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann).

Foucault, Michel. 1995. *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*, trans. Alan Sheridan (New York: Vintage; 1st French ed. 1975).

   2005. *Hermeneutics of the Subject: Lectures at the Collège de France 1981–1982*, trans. Graham Burchell (New York: Picador).

Frankfurt, Harry. 2005. *On Bullshit* (Princeton University Press).

Freeman, Lauren. 2015. "Phenomenology of Racial Oppression," *Knowledge Cultures* 3: 24–44.

Freeman, Lauren and Andreas Elpidorou. 2015. "Affectivity in Heidegger II: Temporality, Boredom and Beyond," *Philosophy Compass* 10: 672–84.

   2019. "Is Profound Boredom Boredom?" in Christos Hadjioannou (ed.), *Heidegger on Affect* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, in press).

Freud, Sigmund. 2001. "The Uncanny," in *The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud*, vol. xvii, ed. and trans. James Strachey (London: Vintage).

Fried, Gregory. 2000. *Heidegger's Polemos: From Being to Politics* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).

Friedländer, P. 1958. *Plato: An Introduction*, trans. H. Meyerhoff (New York: Harper, Bollingen).

Friedman, Michael. 2000. *A Parting of the Ways: Carnap, Cassirer, and Heidegger* (Chicago, IL: Open Court).

Frings, Manfred. 1988. "Parmenides: Heidegger's 1942–1943 Lecture," *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 19/1: 15–33.

Fryer, David Ross. 1996. "Of Spirit: Heidegger and Derrida on Metaphysics, Ethics, and National Socialism," *Inquiry* 36/1: 21–44.

Fultner, Barbara. 2013. "Heidegger's Pragmatic-Existential Theory of Language and Assertion," in Mark A. Wrathall (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger's Being and Time* (Cambridge University Press), 201–22.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1972. "Heidegger und die Sprache der Metaphysik," in his *Kleinere Schriften*, vol. iii (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr), 212–30.

   1990. *Gesammelte Werke*, VOL. 1: *Wahrheit und Methode* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr).

   2000. "Subjectivity and Intersubjectivity; Subject and Person," *Continental Philosophy Review* 33/3: 275–87.

   2004. *Truth and Method*, trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall, 2nd rev. ed. (London: Continuum).

   2014. *Hermeneutics Between History and Philosophy: The Selected Writings of Hans-Georg Gadamer*, vol. 1, ed. and trans. Pol Vandevelde and Arun Iyer (London: Bloomsbury).

Gaifman, Milette. 2018. *The Art of Libation in Classical Athens* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).

Gander, Hans-Helmuth and Magnus Striet (eds.). 2017. *Heideggers Weg in die Moderne: Eine Verortung der Schwarzen Hefte* (Frankfurt: Klostermann).

Gethmann, Carl Friedrich. 1988. "Heideggers Konzeption des Handelns in *Sein und Zeit*," in Annemarie Gethmann-Siefert and Otto Poeggeler (eds.), *Heidegger und die praktische Philosophie* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp), 140–76.

Gibson, J.J. 1986. *The Ecological Approach to Visual Perception* (Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates).

Glare, P.G.W. (ed.). 1982. *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Glazebrook, Trish. 2000. *Heidegger's Philosophy of Science* (New York: Fordham University Press).

    2001. "Heidegger and Scientific Realism," *Continental Philosophy Review* 34/4: 361–401.

    (ed.). 2012. *Heidegger on Science* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

Glendinning, Simon. 2001. "Much Ado About Nothing," *Ratio* 14: 281–88.

Golob, Sacha. 2013. "Heidegger on Kant, Time, and the 'Form' of Intentionality," *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 21/2: 345–67.

    2014. *Heidegger on Concepts, Freedom and Normativity* (Cambridge University Press).

Gooch, Todd A. 2000. *The Numinous and Modernity: An Interpretation of Rudolf Otto's Philosophy of Religion* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter).

Gordon, Peter Eli. 2005. "Myth and Modernity: Cassirer's Critique of Heidegger," *New German Critique* 94: 127–68.

Gothlin, Eva. 2003. "Reading Simone de Beauvoir with Martin Heidegger," in Claudia Card (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Simone de Beauvoir* (Cambridge University Press), 45–65.

Grant, Mary Amelia. 1960. *The Myths of Hyginus* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Publications).

Grimm, J. and W. Grimm. 1854. *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm*, vol. I (Leipzig: S. Hirzel).

    1862. *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm*, vol. III (Leipzig: S. Hirzel).

    1878. *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob Grimm und Wilhelm Grimm*, vol. IV (Leipzig: S. Hirzel).

Guignon, Charles. 1983. *Heidegger and the Problem of Knowledge* (Indianapolis: Hackett).

    2005. "The History of Being," in Dreyfus and Wrathall 2005, 392–405.

    2006a. "Authenticity, Moral Values, and Psychotherapy," in Guignon 2006b, 215–39.

    (ed.). 2006b. *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger* (Cambridge University Press).

Gurwitsch, Aron. 1979. *Human Encounters in the Social World*, ed. Alexandre Métraux, trans. Fred Kersten (Pittsburgh, PA: Duquesne University Press).

Guzzoni, Ute. 2009. *Der andere Heidegger: Überlegungen zu seinem späteren Denken* (Munich: Alber).

Haar, Michel. 1983. "The End of Distress: The End of Technology?" *Research in Phenomenology* 13/1: 43–63.

    1993. *Heidegger and the Essence of Man*, trans. William McNeil (Albany: State University of New York Press).

Han-Pile, Béatrice. 2013. "Freedom and the 'Choice to Choose Oneself,'" in Wrathall 2013a, 291–319.

Harries, Karsten. 1997. *The Ethical Function of Architecture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

    2009. *Art Matters: A Critical Commentary on Heidegger's 'The Origin of the Work of Art'*. Contributions to Phenomenology 57 (New York: Springer).

Hartmann, Nicolai. 1909. *Platos Logik des Seins* (Gießen: Töpelmann).

Hatab, Lawrence J. and William Brenner. 1983. "Heidegger and Wittgenstein on Language and Mystery," *International Studies in Philosophy* 15/3: 25–43.

Haugeland, John. 1979. "Understanding Natural Language," *Journal of Philosophy* 76: 619–32.

    1982. "Heidegger on Being a Person," *Noûs* 16: 16–26.

    2000. "Truth and Finitude: Heidegger's Transcendental Existentialism," in Mark A. Wrathall and Jeff Malpas (eds.), *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press), 43–78.

    2005. "Reading Brandom Reading Heidegger," *European Journal of Philosophy* 13: 421–28.

    2013. *Dasein Disclosed: John Haugeland's Heidegger*, ed. Joseph Rouse (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Heck, Richard. 2000. "Nonconceptual Content and the Space of Reasons," *Philosophical Review* 109: 483–523.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. 1972. *Werke*, VOL. III: *Phänomenologie des Geistes* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp).

    1977. *Phenomenology of Spirit*, trans. A.V. Miller (Oxford: Clarendon Press; 1st German ed. 1807).

Heinz, Marion and Sidonie Keller (eds.). 2016. *Martin Heideggers 'Schwarze Hefte': Eine philosophische Debatte* (Berlin: Suhrkamp).

Held, Klaus. 1988. "Heidegger und das Prinzip der Phaenomenologie," in Annemarie Gethmann-Siefert and Otto Poeggeler (eds.), *Heidegger und die praktische Philosophie* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp), 111–39.

    1992. "Heidegger and the Principle of Phenomenology," in Christopher Macann (ed.), *Martin Heidegger: Critical Assessments*, vol. 11 (London: Routledge), 303–25.

Henrich, Dieter. 1994. *The Unity of Reason: Essays on Kant's Philosophy*, ed. Richard Velkey (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Herrmann, F.W. 2000. *Hermeneutik und Reflexion: Der Begriff der Phänomenologie bei Heidegger und Husserl* (Frankfurt: Klostermann).

    2013. *Hermeneutics and Reflection: Heidegger and Husserl on the Concept of Phenomenology*, trans. Kenneth Maly (University of Toronto Press).

Hinderling, Robert. 1982. "Konkurrenz und Opposition in der verbalen Wortbildung," in Eichinger *et al.* 1982, 81–106.

Hirsch, Elisabeth Feist. 1978. "The Problem of Speech in *Being and Time*," in Frederick Elliston (ed.), *Heidegger's Existential Analytic* (The Hague: Mouton), 159–78.

Hodge, Joanna. 1995. *Heidegger and Ethics* (London: Routledge).

Höfner, Markus. 2008. *Sinn, Symbol, Religion: Theorie des Zeichens und Phänomenologie der Religion* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Hope, Jonathan. 2014. "*The Sign in Heidegger's Sein und Zeit*," *Semiotica* 202: 259–72.

Hornblower, Simon, Anthone Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow (eds.). 2012. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, 4th ed. (Oxford University Press).

Hoy, David. 1989. "Philosophemes," *London Review of Books* 11/22: 8–10.

Husserl, Edmund. 1910–11. "Philosophy als strenge Wissenschaft," *Logos* 1/3: 289–341.

    1939. *Erfahrung und Urteil: Untersuchungen zur Genealogie der Logik*, ed. L. Landgrebe (Prague: Academia Verlagsbuchhandlung).

    1952. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie*, vol. 11: *Phänomenologische Untersuchungen zur Konstitution*, ed. M. Biemel (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff).

    1959. *Phänomenologische Psychologie: Vorlesungen Sommersemester 1925* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff).

    1976. *Ideen zu einer reinen Phänomenologie und phänomenologischen Philosophie*, vol. 1: *Allgemeine Einführung in die reine Phänomenologie*, ed. K. Schuhmann (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff).

    1977a. *Cartesianische Meditationen* (Hamburg: Felix Meiner).

    1977b. *Phenomenological Psychology*, trans. John Scanlon (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff).

    1981. "Husserl's Inaugural Lecture at Freiburg im Breisgau," trans. R.W. Jordan, in *Husserl: Shorter Works*, ed. Peter McCormick and Frederick A. Elliston (University of Notre Dame Press; 1st German ed. 1917).

    1982. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy*, vol. 1, trans. F. Kersten (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff).

    1984. *Einleitung in die Logik und Erkenntnistheorie*, ed. Ullrich Melle (Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff).

    1989. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy*, vol. 11, trans. R. Rojecewicz and A. Schuwer (Dordrecht: Kluwer).

    1991. *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology*, trans. Dorion Cairns (Dordrecht: Kluwer).

    1993. *Die Krisis der Europäischen Wissenschaften und die transzendentale Phänomenologie. Ergänzungsband: Texte aus dem Nachlass 1934–1937* (Dordrecht: Martinus Nijhoff).

    2001a. *Analyses Concerning Passive and Active Synthesis: Lectures on Transcendental Logic*, trans. Anthony J. Steinbock (Dordrecht: Kluwer).

    2001b. *Logical Investigations*, trans. J.N. Findlay, ed. Dermot Moran, 2 vols. (London: Routledge).

    2014. *Ideas I*, trans. Daniel O. Dahlstrom (Indianapolis: Hackett).

Ihmdahl, Georg. 1997. *Das Leben verstehen: Heideggers formal anzeigenden Hermeneutik in den frühen Freiburger Vorlesungen* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann).

Ijsseling, Samuel. 1986. "Heidegger and the Destruction of Ontology," in Joseph J. Kockelmans (ed.), *A Companion to Heidegger's Being and Time* (Washington, DC: Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology and University Press of America), 3–16.

Inwood, Michael. 1999. *A Heidegger Dictionary* (Malden, MA: Blackwell).

Jaran, François and Christophe Perrin. 2013. *The Heidegger Concordance*, 3 vols. (London: Bloomsbury).

Johnston, Mark. 2011. *Surviving Death* (Princeton University Press).

Jollivet, Servanne. 2003. "De la guerre au *polemos*: Le destin tragique de l'être," *Astérion* 3 (unpaginated).

Jonas, Hans. 1963. *The Gnostic Religion: The Message of the Alien God and the Beginnings of Christianity* (Boston: Beacon Press).

Kahn, Charles H. (ed.). 1979. *The Art and Thought of Heraclitus* (Cambridge University Press).

Kant, Immanuel. 1990. *Kritik der Urteilskraft*, ed. K. Vorländer (Hamburg: Meiner).

   1998. *Critique of Pure Reason*, trans. Paul Guyer (Cambridge University Press).

Katz, David. 1925. *Der Aufbau der Tastwelt* (Leipzig: Johann Ambrosius Barth).

Käufer, Stephan. 2005a. "Logic," in Dreyfus and Wrathall 2005, 141–55.

   2005b. "The Nothing and the Ontological Difference in Heidegger's 'What Is Metaphysics?'" *Inquiry* 48: 482–506.

   2011. "On Heidegger on Logic," *Continental Philosophy Review* 34/4: 455–76.

   2013. "Temporality as the Ontological Sense of Care," in Mark A. Wrathall (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Heidegger's Being and Time* (Cambridge University Press), 338–59.

   2015. "Jaspers, Limit-Situations, and the Methodological Function of Authenticity," in McManus 2015c, 95–115.

Kaufmann, Walter (ed.). 1954. *The Portable Nietzsche*. New York: Penguin.

Keck, Wolfgang and Rastko Jovanov. 2013. "Technik, Gelassenheit und πολεμος," *Filosofija i Društvo* 4: 284–94.

Keiling, Tobias. 2015. *Seinsgeschichte und phänomenologischer Realismus* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

Keller, Pierre. 2000. *Husserl and Heidegger on Human Experience* (Cambridge University Press).

Kierkegaard, Soren. 1987. *Either/Or, Part 2*, trans. H. Hong and E. Hong (Princeton University Press).

   1997. *Christian Discourses/The Crisis and a Crisis in the Life of an Actress*, trans. H. Hong and E. Hong (Princeton University Press).

   2009. *Repetition and Philosophical Crumbs*, trans. M. Piety (Oxford University Press).

Kim, Alan. 2004. "Shades of Truth: A Phenomenological Approach to the Allegory of the Cave," *Idealistic Studies* 34/1: 1–24.

   2005. "Frameworks and Foundations: Heidegger and Natorp on Science and Technology," *Angelaki* 10/1: 201–18.

   2015. "Neo-Kantian Ideas of History," in Nicolas De Warren and Andrea Staiti (eds.), *New Approaches to Neo-Kantianism* (Cambridge University Press), 39–58.

Kisiel, Theodore. 1993. *The Genesis of Heidegger's Being and Time* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

   1995. "Why Students of Heidegger Will Have to Read Emil Lask," *Man and World* 28: 197–240.

   1996. "L'indication formelle de la facticité: Sa genèse et son transformation," in J.-F. Courtine (ed.), *Heidegger 1919–1929: De l'herméneutique à la métaphysique du Dasein* (Paris: Jean Vrin), 205–10.

   2002. *Heidegger's Way of Thought: Critical and Interpretive Signposts* (London: Continuum).

   2014. "Heidegger and our Twenty-First-Century Experience of Ge-Stell," in Babette Babich and Dimitri Ginev (eds.), *The Multidimensionality of Hermeneutic Phenomenology* (New York: Springer), 137–51.

   2017. "How Heidegger Resolved the Tension Between Technological Globalization and Indigenous Localization: A 21st Century Retrieval," in Holger Zaborowski (ed.), *Heidegger's Question of Being: Dasein, Truth, and History* (Washington, DC: Catholic University of America Press), 184–206.

Knowles, Adam. 2013. "Toward a Critique of Walten: Heidegger, Derrida and Henological Difference," *Journal of Speculative Philosophy* 27/3: 265–76.

Kockelmans, Joseph J. (ed.). 1972. *On Heidegger and Language* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press).

Korsgaard, Christine M. 1996. *The Sources of Normativity* (Cambridge University Press).

Krell, David Farrell. 1986. *Intimations of Mortality: Time, Truth, and Finitude in Heidegger's Thinking of Being* (University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press).

2015. *Ecstasy, Catastrophe: Heidegger from Being and Time to the Black Notebooks* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

Krug, W.T. 1832–38. *Allgemeines Handwörterbuch der philosophischen Wissenschaften*, 5 vols. (Leipzig: Brockhaus).

Kuhn, Thomas. 1962. *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (University of Chicago Press).

Kühnhold, I. 1970. "Beobachtungen zu den Verbalpräfixen ab-, aus-, ent-," in H. Moser, H. Eggers, J. Erben, H. Neumann and H. Steger (eds.), *Studien zur Syntax des heutigen Deutsch* (Düsseldorf: Schwann Moser), 269–74.

Kühnhold, I. and Wellmann, H. 1973a. *Deutsche Wortbildung: Erster Hauptteil: Das Verb* (Düsseldorf: Schwann).

1973b. *Deutsche Wortbildung: Typen und Tendenzen in der Gegenwartssprache* (Düsseldorf: Schwann).

Lacoue-Labarthe, Philippe. 2007a. *Heidegger and the Politics of Poetry*, trans. by Jeff Fort (Urbana: University of Illinois Press).

2007b. *La vraie semblance* (Paris: Éditions Galilée).

Lafont, Cristina. 2000. *Heidegger, Language, and World-Disclosure*, trans. Graham Harman (Cambridge University Press).

2002. "Symposium: Cristina Lafont, Heidegger, Language, and World-Disclosure, Replies," *Inquiry* 45: 229–48.

2005. "Hermeneutics," in Dreyfus and Wrathall 2005, 276–79.

2007. "Heidegger and the Synthetic a Priori," in Crowell and Malpas 2007, 104–18.

Lazzari, Riccardo. 2002. *Ontologia de la fatticità* (Milan: Franco Angeli).

Lear, Jonathan. 2006. *Radical Hope* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Leibniz, G.W.F.V. 1989. *Philosophical Essays* (Indianapolis: Hackett).

Locke, John. 1997. *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (London: Penguin; 1st ed. 1689).

Löwith, Karl. 1928. *Das Individuum in der Rolle des Mitmenschen* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).

1995. *Martin Heidegger and European Nihilism*, ed. Richard Wolin, trans. Gary Steiner (New York: Columbia University Press).

Luchte, James. 2008. *Heidegger's Early Philosophy: The Phenomenology of Ecstatic Temporality* (London: Continuum).

Lüders, Detlev. 2001. "Der 'Zauber der Welt' und das heutige 'Chaos': Heidegger und die moderne Dominanz des Dürftigen," *Heidegger Studies* 17: 21–43.

Lyne, Ian. 2000. "Rickert and Heidegger: On the Value of Everyday Objects," *Kant-Studien* 91/2: 204–25.

Macann, Christopher (ed.). 1996. *Critical Heidegger* (London: Routledge).

MacAvoy, Leslie. 2010. "Formal Indication and the Hermeneutics of Facticity," *Philosophy Today* 54 (supplement): 84–90.

Malpas, Jeff. 1998. "Death and the unity of a Life," in Jeff Malpas and Robert Solomon (eds.), *Death and Philosophy* (London: Routledge), 120–34.

2006. *Heidegger's Topology: Being, Place, World* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

2012. *Heidegger and the Thinking of Place: Explorations in the Topology of Being* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

2016. "The Beckoning of Language: Heidegger's Hermeneutic Transformation of Thinking," in Michael Bowler and Ingo Farin (eds.), *Hermeneutical Heidegger* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press), 203–21.

Marion, Jean-Luc. 1992. "Heidegger and Descartes," in Christopher Macann (ed.), *Heidegger: Critical Assessments*, vol. 11 (London: Routledge), 178–207.

1998. *Reduction and Givenness: Investigations of Husserl, Heidegger, and Phenomenology*, trans. Thomas A. Carlson (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press).

2002. *Being Given: Toward a Phenomenology of Givenness*, trans. Jeffrey L. Kosky (Stanford: Stanford University Press).

Martin, Wayne. 2013. "The Semantics of 'Dasein' and the Modality of *Being and Time*," in Wrathall 2013a, 100–28.

May, Reinhard. 1996. *Heidegger's Hidden Sources: East Asian Influences on his Work*, trans. Graham Parkes (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press).

McManus, Denis. 2012. *Heidegger and the Measure of Truth: Themes from his Early Philosophy* (Oxford University Press).

2015a. "Being-towards-death and Owning One's Judgment," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 91: 245–72.

2015b. "On Being as a Whole and Being-a-whole," in Braver 2015, 175–95.

(ed.). 2015c. *Heidegger, Authenticity and the Self: Themes from Division Two of Being and Time* (London: Routledge).

McMullin, Irene. 2013. *Time and the Shared World: Heidegger on Social Relations* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press).

McNeill, William. 1999. *The Glance of the Eye: Heidegger, Aristotle, and the Ends of Theory* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

2001. "The Time of *Contributions to Philosophy*," in Charles Scott *et al.* (eds.), *A Companion to Heidegger's Contributions to Philosophy* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), 129–40.

2006. *The Time of Life: Heidegger and Ethos* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

2009. "Rethinking the Possible: On the Radicalization of Possibility in Heidegger's Being and Time," *theory@buffalo* 13: 105–25.

2012. "From *Destruktion* to the History of Being," *Gatherings: The Heidegger Circle Annual* 2: 24–40.

2013a. "In Force of Language: Language and Desire in Heidegger's Readings of Aristotle's *Metaphysics* Θ," in Powell 2013, 46–62.

2013b. "Heidegger's Hölderlin Lectures," in François Raffoul and Eric S. Nelson (eds.), *The Bloomsbury Companion to Heidegger* (New York: Bloomsbury), 223–36.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 2012. *The Phenomenology of Perception*, trans. Donald A. Landes (New York: Routledge).

Michel, Andreas. 1997. "Differentiation vs. Disenchantment: The Persistence of Modernity from Max Weber to Jean-François Lyotard," *German Studies Review* 20/3: 343–70.

Milchman, Alan and Alan Rosenberg. 2003. "Towards a Heidegger/Foucault Auseinandersetzung," in Alan Milchman and Alan Rosenberg (eds.), *Foucault and Heidegger: Critical Encounters* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press), 1–29.

Mill, John Stuart. 1900. *A System of Logic* (London: Longmans, Green).

Misch, Georg. 1931. *Lebensphilosophie und Phänomenologie* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).

Mitchell, Andrew. 2015. *The Fourfold: Reading the Late Heidegger* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press).

Mitchell, Andrew J. and Peter Trawny (eds.). 2017. *Heidegger's Black Notebooks* (New York: Columbia University Press).

Mohanty, J.N. 1988. "Heidegger on Logic," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 26: 107–35.

Mongis, Henri. 1976. *Heidegger et la critique de la notion de valeur* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff).

Moran, Dermot. 1994. "The Destruction of the Destruction: Heidegger's Versions of the History of Philosophy," in K. Harries and C. Jamme (eds.), *Martin Heidegger: Politics, Art, and Technology* (New York: Holmes & Meier), 175–96.

2000. *Introduction to Phenomenology* (London: Routledge).

Moser, H., H. Eggers, J. Erben, H. Neumann, and H. Steger (eds.). 1970. *Studien zur Syntax des heutigen Deutsch* (Düsseldorf: Schwann).

Mugerauer, Robert. 2008. *Heidegger and Homecoming: The Leitmotif in the Later Writings* (University of Toronto Press).

Mulhall, Stephen. 1996. *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Heidegger and Being and Time* (London: Routledge).

2001. *Inheritance and Originality: Wittgenstein, Heidegger, Kierkegaard* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

2007. *Philosophical Myths of the Fall* (Princeton University Press).

Nagel, Thomas. 1979. *Mortal Questions* (Cambridge University Press).

Nancy, Jean-Luc. 2000. *Being Singular Plural*, trans. R. Richardson and A. O'Byrne (Stanford University Press).

2008. "The Being-With of Being-There," *Continental Philosophy Review* 41/1: 1–15.

Natorp, Paul. 1994. *Platos Ideenlehre: Eine Einführung in den Idealismus* (Hamburg: Meiner).

Neske, Günter and Emil Kettering (eds.). 1990. *Martin Heidegger and National Socialism* (New York: Paragon House).

Neumann, Günther. 2006. "Sein und Logos," in Denker and Zaborowski 2006, 65–87.

Nicholson, Graeme. 1986. "Ecstatic Temporality in *Sein und Zeit*," in Joseph J. Kockelmans (ed.), *A Companion to Martin Heidegger's Being and Time* (Washington, DC: Center for Advanced Research in Phenomenology and University Press of America), 208–26.

Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1996. *On the Genealogy of Morals*, trans. D. Smith (Oxford University Press).

2012. *The Gay Science*, trans. Josefine Nauckhoff and Adrian Del Caro (Cambridge University Press).

Nitsche, Martin. 2013. *Die Ortschaft des Seins: Martin Heideggers phänomenologische Topologie* (Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann).

Novak, David. 1985. "Buber's Critique of Heidegger," *Modern Judaism* 5 (Gershom Scholem Memorial Issue): 125–40.

Oberst, Joachim. 2011. *Heidegger on Language and Death: The Intrinsic Connection in Human Existence* (London: Bloomsbury).

Okrent, Mark. 1984. "Hermeneutics, Transcendental Philosophy and Social Science," *Inquiry* 27: 23–49.

2005. "The Truth of Being and the History of Philosophy," in Dreyfus and Wrathall 2005, 468–83.

2007. "The 'I Think' and the For-the-Sake-of-Which," in Crowell and Malpas 2007, 151–68.

Olafson, Frederick A. 1975. "Consciousness and Intentionality in Heidegger's Thought," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 12/2: 91–103.

1987. *Heidegger and the Philosophy of Mind* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).

1995. *What Is a Human Being? A Heideggerian View* (Cambridge University Press).

1998a. "Being, Truth, and Presence in Heidegger's Thought," *Inquiry* 41/1: 45–64.

1998b. *Heidegger and the Ground of Ethics: A Study of Mitsein* (Cambridge University Press).

Ó Murchadha, Felix. 2013. *The Time of Revolution: Kairos and Chronos in Heidegger* (London: Bloomsbury).

Ott, Heinrich. 1972. "Hermeneutic and Personal Structure of Language," in Joseph J. Kockelmans 1972, 169–94.

Otto, Walter Friedrich. 1964. *The Homeric Gods: The Spiritual Significance of Greek Religion*, trans. Moses Hadas (Boston, MA: Beacon Press).

Oudemans, Theodore C.W. 1990. "Heideggers 'logische Untersuchungen,'" *Heidegger Studies* 6: 85–105.

Overgaard, Søren. 2004. *Husserl and Heidegger on Being in the World* (Dordrecht: Kluwer).

Parker, Robert. 2011. *On Greek Religion* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

Perry, John. 2005. "Personal Identity, Memory and the Self," in Willy Østreng (ed.), *Synergies: Interdisciplinary Communications* (Oslo: Center for Advanced Study), 16–25.

Petkovšek, R. 1998. *Heidegger-Index (1919–1927)* (Ljubljana: Teološka Fakulteta Liubliana).

Phillips, James. 2005. *Heidegger's Volk* (Stanford University Press).

Pippin, Robert. 2003. "Love and Death in Nietzsche," in Mark A. Wrathall (ed.), *Religion After Metaphysics* (Cambridge University Press), 7–28.

2013a. "Heidegger on Nietzsche on Nihilism," in Thomas L. Pangle and J. Harvey Lomax (eds.), *Political Philosophy Cross-Examined: Perennial Challenges to the Philosophic Life* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan), 173–87.

2013b. *After the Beautiful* (University of Chicago Press).

2015. "Heidegger on Nietzsche on Nihilism," in his *Interanimations: Receiving Modern German Philosophy* (University of Chicago Press).

Plato. 1977. *Werke in acht Bänden*, ed. Gunther Eigler *et al.* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).

Plessner, Helmuth. 1975. *Die Stufen des Organischen und der Mensch* (Berlin: de Gruyter).

Pöggeler, Otto. 1972. *Philosophie und Politik bei Heidegger* (Freiburg: Alber).

1975. "Metaphysics and Topology of Being in Heidegger," *Man and World* 8: 3–27.

1980. "Heideggers Neubestimmung des Phänomenbegriffs," *Phänomenologische Forschungen* 9: 124–62.

1987. *Martin Heidegger's Path of Thinking* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International).

1989. "Heideggers logische Untersuchungen," in R. Blasche, W. Kohler, W. Kuhlmann, and P. Rohs (eds.), *Martin Heidegger: Innen- und Aussenansichten* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp), 75–100.

1994a. *Der Denkweg Martin Heideggers* (Stuttgart: Neske).

1994b. "Heidegger on Art," in K. Harries and C. Jamme (eds.), *Martin Heidegger: Politics, Art, and Technology* (New York: Holmes & Meier), 107–10.

Polt, Richard. 1999. *Heidegger: An Introduction* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

2006. *The Emergency of Being: On Heidegger's Contributions to Philosophy* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press).

2010. "Being and Time," in Davis 2014b, 69–81.

2013. "The Secret Homeland of Speech: Heidegger on Language, 1933–34," in Powell 2013, 63–85.

Powell, Jeffrey (ed.). 2013. *Heidegger and Language* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Prauss, Gerold. 1977. *Erkennen und Handeln in Heideggers Sein und Zeit* (Freiburg: Alber).

Raffoul, François. 1998. *Heidegger and the Subject* (Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press).

Ratcliffe, Matthew J. 2008. *Feelings of Being: Phenomenology, Psychiatry and the Sense of Reality* (Oxford University Press).

2013. "Why Mood Matters," in Wrathall 2013a, 157–76.

Reid, James D. 2005. "Ethical Criticism in Heidegger's Early Freiburg Lectures," *Review of Metaphysics* 59/1: 33–71.

2018. *Heidegger's Moral Ontology* (Cambridge University Press).

Remington, Clark A. 2012. *Originary Temporality: An Essay on Heidegger's Being and Time and his Interpretation of Kant*, Ph.D. thesis, University of Chicago.

Richardson, John. 1996. *Nietzsche's System* (New York: Oxford University Press).

2012. *Heidegger* (New York: Routledge).

Richardson, William J. 1968. "Heidegger's Critique of Science," *New Scholasticism* 42: 511–36.

1974. *Heidegger: Through Phenomenology to Thought*, 3rd ed. (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff; 1st ed. 1963).

Ricoeur, Paul. 1981. "Phenomenology and Hermeneutics," in his *Hermeneutics and the Human Sciences*, ed. and trans. John B. Thompson (Cambridge University Press), 101–31.

Riis, Søren. 2011. *Zur Neubestimmung der Technik: Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Martin Heidegger* (Tübingen: Francke).

Rockmore, Tom (ed.). 2000. *Heidegger, German Idealism, and Neo-Kantianism* (Amherst, NY: Humanity Books).

Rodríguez, Ramón. 1997. *La transformación hermenéutica de la fenomenología* (Madrid: Tecnos).

Rojcewicz, Richard. 2006. *The Gods and Technology: A Reading of Heidegger* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

Rorty, Richard. 1982. *Consequences of Pragmatism* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota).

Rouse, Joseph. 1981. "Kuhn, Heidegger, and Scientific Realism," *Man and World* 14: 269–90.

2005. "Heidegger's Philosophy of Science," in Dreyfus and Wrathall 2005, 173–89.

Rousse, B. Scot. 2016a. "Heidegger, Sociality, and Human Agency," *European Journal of Philosophy* 24: 417–51.

2016b. "Care, Death, and Time in Heidegger and Frankfurt," in Roman Altshuler and Michael J. Sigrist (eds.), *Time and the Philosophy of Action* (New York: Routledge).

Ruin, Hans. 1998. "The Moment of Truth: *Augenblick* and *Ereignis* in Heidegger," *Epoché* 6: 75–88.

2005a. "Contributions to Philosophy," in Dreyfus and Wrathall 2005, 358–74.

2005b. "Prudence, Passion, and Freedom: On Heidegger's Ideal of *Besinnung*," *Giornale di Metafisica* 28: 29–52.

2012. "Thinking in Ruins: Life, Death, and Destruction in Heidegger's Early Writings," *Comparative and Continental Philosophy* 4/1: 15–33.

Sadler, Ted. 2001. *Heidegger and Aristotle: The Question of Being* (London: Bloomsbury).

Safranski, Rüdiger. 1998. *Martin Heidegger Between Good and Evil* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Sallis, John. 1984. "Towards the Showing of Language," in Robert W. Shahan and Jitendra N. Mohanty (eds.), *Thinking about Being: Aspects of Heidegger's Thought* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press), 75–84.

1986. *Delimitations: Phenomenology and the End of Metaphysics* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

1995. "The Identities of the Things Themselves," in his *Delimitations: Phenomenology and the End of Metaphysics*, 2nd ed. (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), 196–209.

2001. "Grounders of the Abyss," in Charles E. Scott *et al.* (eds.), *Companion to Heidegger's Contributions to Philosophy* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), 181–97.

Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1956. *Being and Nothingness*, trans. Hazel Barnes (New York: Washington Square).

Schalow, Frank. 1992. *The Renewal of the Heidegger–Kant Dialogue: Action, Thought, and Responsibility* (Albany: State University of New York Press).

Schapiro, Meyer. 1994a. "The Still Life as a Personal Object – A Note on Heidegger and van Gogh," in his *Theory and Philosophy of Art: Style, Artist, and Society* (New York: George Braziller), 135–42.

1994b. "Further Notes on Heidegger and van Gogh," in his *Theory and Philosophy of Art: Style, Artist, and Society* (New York: George Braziller), 143–51.

Schatzki, Theodore R. 2005. "Early Heidegger on Sociality," in Dreyfus and Wrathall 2005, 233–47.

2007. *Martin Heidegger: Theorist of Space* (Stuttgart: Steiner).

Schear, Joseph K. 2013a. "Historical Finitude," in Wrathall 2013a, 360–90.

(ed.). 2013b. *Mind, Reason, and Being-in-the-World: The McDowell–Dreyfus Debate* (New York: Routledge).

Scheler, Max. 1973. *Formalism in Ethics and Non-Formal Ethics of Values: A New Attempt Toward the Foundation of an Ethical Personalism*, trans. M.S. Frings and R.L. Funk (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press; 1st German ed. 1954).

1980. *Der Formalismus in der Ethik und die materiale Wertethik*, 6th ed. (Bern and Munich: Francke).

Schmidt, Dennis J. 2001. *On Germans and Other Greeks: Tragedy and Ethical Life* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Schürmann, Reiner. 1990. *Heidegger on Being and Acting: From Principles to Anarchy*, trans. Christine-Marie Gros (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Schütz, Alfred. 1967. *The Phenomenology of the Social World*, trans. G.Walsh and F. Lehnert (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press; 1st German ed. 1932).

Scott, Charles E. 1970. "Heidegger and Consciousness," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 8: 355–72.

2001. "The Appearance of Metaphysics," in Richard Polt and Gregory Fried (eds.), *A Companion to Heidegger's Introduction to Metaphysics* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press), 17–33.

Seubold, Günter. 1993. "Heideggers nachgelassene Klee-Notizen," *Heidegger Studies* 9: 5–12.

Sharr, Adam. 2006. *Heidegger's Hut* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

2007. *Heidegger for Architects* (London: Routledge).

Sheehan, Thomas. 1981. "On Movement and the Destruction of Ontology," *The Monist* 64: 534–42.

2001. "A Paradigm Shift in Heidegger Research," *Continental Philosophy Review* 34: 183–202.

2010. "The Turn," in Davis 2014b, 82–101.

2015. *Making Sense of Heidegger: A Paradigm Shift* (London: Rowman & Littlefield).

Sheehan, Thomas and Corinn Painter. 1999. "Choosing One's Fate: A Re-reading of *Sein und Zeit* §74," *Research in Phenomenology* 29: 63–82.

Sherover, Charles M. 1971. *Heidegger, Kant and Time* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Shirley, Greg. 2010. *Heidegger and Logic: The Place of Lógos in Being and Time* (London: Continuum).

Sikka, Sonia. 1994. "Heidegger's Concept of Volk," *Philosophical Forum* 26: 101–26.

2017. *Heidegger, Morality and Politics: Questioning the Shepherd of Being* (Cambridge University Press).

Sinnerbrink, Robert. 2008. "*Sein und Geist*: Heidegger's Confrontation with Hegel's Phenomenology," in Paul Ashton, Toula Nicolacopoulos, and George Vassilacopoulos (eds.), *The Spirit of the Age* (Melbourne: re.press), 185–204.

Slaby, Jan. 2010. "The Other Side of Existence: Heidegger on Boredom," in Sabine Flach, Daniel Margulies, and Jan Söffner (eds.), *Habitus in Habitat II: Other Sides of Cognition* (Bern: Peter Lang), 101–20.

2015. "Affectivity and Temporality in Heidegger," in M. Ubiali and M. Wehrle (eds.), *Feeling and Value, Willing and Action*, Phaenomenologica 216 (Dordrecht: Springer), 183–206.

2017a. "Living in the Moment: Boredom and the Meaning of Existence in Heidegger and Pessoa," in H. Feger, X. Dikun and W. Ge (eds.), *Yearbook for Eastern and Western Philosophy*, vol. 11 (Berlin: de Gruyter), 235–56.

2017b. "More than a Feeling: Affect as Radical Situatedness," *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 41: 7–26.

Slaby, Jan and Achim Stephan. 2008. "Affective Intentionality and Self-Consciousness," *Consciousness and Cognition* 17: 506–13.

Sluga, Hans. 2005. "Heidegger's Nietzsche," in Dreyfus and Wrathall 2005, 102–20.

Soffer, Gail. 1996. "Heidegger, Humanism, and the Destruction of History," *Review of Metaphysics* 49: 547–76.

Sörensen, Paul and Nikolai Münch (eds.). 2013. *Politische theorie und das Denken Heideggers* (Bielefeld: Transcript).

Spinosa, Charles. 2005. "Derrida and Heidegger: Iterability and *Ereignis*," in Dreyfus and Wrathall 2005, 484–510.

Stafford, Sue and Wanda Torres Gregory. 2006. "Heidegger's Phenomenology of Boredom, and the Scientific Investigation of Conscious Experience," *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 5: 155–69.

Stevenson, Michael. 2012. *Subjectivity and Selfhood in Kant, Fichte, and Heidegger*, Ph.D. thesis, Columbia University.

Taminiaux, Jacques. 1989a. "Heidegger lecteur de Descartes," in Walter Biemel and Friedrich-Wilhelm von Herrmann (eds.), *Kunst und Technik: Gedächtnisschrift zum 100. Geburtstag von Martin Heidegger* (Frankfurt: Klostermann), 109–23.

1989b. *Lectures de l'ontologie fondamentale: Essais sur Heidegger* (Grenoble: Millon).

Taylor, Charles. 1989. *Sources of the Self* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

1992. "Heidegger, Language, and Ecology," in Hubert L. Dreyfus and Harrison Hall (eds.), *Heidegger: A Critical Reader* (London: Blackwell), 247–69.

2006. "Engaged Agency and Background in Heidegger," in Guignon 2006b, 202–21.

2007. *A Secular Age* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Theunissen, Michel. 1984. *The Other: Studies in the Social Ontology of Husserl, Heidegger, Sartre and Buber*. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press).

Thomann, Erik. 2004. "Martin Heidegger, 'Unterwegs zur Sprache': Ein Denkweg zwischen Selbstbehauptung und Gefolgschaftsorientierung," in his *Die Entmündigung des Menschen durch die Sprache: . . . und die Suche nach authentischer Subjektivität* (Vienna: Passagen), 35–80.

Thomson, Iain. 1999. "Can I Die? Derrida on Heidegger on Death," *Philosophy Today* 43: 29–42.

2004a. "Heidegger's Perfectionist Philosophy of Education in *Being and Time*," *Continental Philosophy Review* 37: 439–67.

2004b. "Ontology and Ethics at the Intersection of Phenomenology and Environmental Philosophy," *Inquiry* 47: 380–412.

2005. *Heidegger on Ontotheology: Technology and the Politics of Education* (Cambridge University Press).

2007. "On the Advantages and Disadvantages of Reading Heidegger Backward: White's Time and Death," *Inquiry* 50: 103–20.

2009. "Rethinking Levinas on Heidegger on Death," *Harvard Review of Philosophy* 16: 23–43.

2011a. *Heidegger, Art, and Postmodernity* (Cambridge University Press).

2011b. "Transcendence and the Problem of Otherworldly Nihilism: Taylor, Heidegger, Nietzsche," *Inquiry* 54: 140–59.

2012. "In the Future Philosophy will be Neither Continental nor Analytic but Synthetic: Toward a Promiscuous Miscegenation of (All) Philosophical Traditions and Styles," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 50: 191–205.

2013. "Death and Demise in *Being and Time*," in Wrathall 2013a, 260–90.

2015. "The Failure of Philosophy: Why Didn't *Being and Time* Answer the Question of Being?" in Braver 2015, 285–310.

2016a. "Heideggerian Phenomenology and the Postmetaphysical Politics of Ontological Pluralism," in S. West Gurley and Geoffrey Pfeifer (eds.), *Phenomenology and the Political* (London: Rowman & Littlefield International), 19–42.

2016b. "Rethinking Education After Heidegger: Teaching Learning as Ontological Response-Ability," *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 48: 846–61.

2016c. "Thinking Love: Heidegger and Arendt," *Continental Philosophy Review* 50/4: 453–78.

2017. "Heidegger's Nazism in the Light of his Early Black Notebooks: A View from America," in Alfred Denker and Holger Zaborowski (eds.), *Zur Hermeneutik der Schwarzen Hefte*, Heidegger Jahrbuch 10 (Freiburg: Karl Alber), 184–209.

Thomson, Iain and Jim Bodington. 2014. "Against Immortality: Why Death is Better than the Alternative," in Russell Blackford and Damian Broderick (eds.), *Intelligence Unbound* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell), 248–62.

Tomasello, Michael. 1999. *The Cultural Origins of Human Cognition* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

Torsen, Ingvild. 2014. "What was Abstract Art? (From the Point of View of Heidegger)," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 72: 291–302.

Trawny, Peter. 2004. *Heidegger und Hölderlin oder der europäische Morgen* (Würzburg: Königshausen und Neumann).

2007. "Die Moderne als Weltkrieg: Der Krieg bei Heidegger und Patočka," *Studia Phaenomenologica* 7: 377–94.

2014. *Heidegger und der Mythos der jüdischen Weltverschwörung* (Frankfurt: Klostermann).

Trawny, Peter and Andrew J. Mitchell (eds.). 2015. *Heidegger, die Juden, noch einmal* (Frankfurt: Klostermann).

Tresh, John. 2007. "Technological World-Pictures: Cosmic Things and Cosmograms," *Isis* 98: 84–99.

Tugendhat, Ernst. 1970. *Der Wahrheitsbegriff bei Husserl und Heidegger* (Berlin: de Gruyter)

1996. "Heidegger's Idea of Truth," in Macann 1996, 227–40.

Vallega-Neu, Daniela. 2001. "Poietic Saying," in Charles E. Scott *et al.* (eds.), *Companion to Heidegger's Contributions to Philosophy* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press), 66–80.

2003. *Heidegger's Contributions to Philosophy: An Introduction* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

2013. "Heidegger's Poietic Writings: From *Contributions to Philosophy* to *Das Ereignis*," in Powell 2013, 119–45.

Van Buren, John. 1994. *The Young Heidegger* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Vandevelde, Pol. 2012. *Heidegger and the Romantics: The Literary Invention of Meaning* (New York: Routledge).

2014. "Language as the House of Being? How to Bring Intelligibility to Heidegger While Keeping the Excitement," *Philosophy Compass* 9: 253–62.

van Dyk, R.J.A. 1991. "Grundbegriffe der Metaphysik: Zur formalanzeigenden Struktur der philosophischen Begriffe bei Heidegger," *Heidegger Studies* 7: 89–109.

Velleman, David J. 1992. "What Happens When Someone Acts?" *Mind* 101: 461–81.

Vietta, Silvio. 2015. *'Etwas rast um den Erdball …': Martin Heidegger, Ambivalente Existenz und Globalisierungskritik* (Paderborn: Wilhelm Fink).

Villel-Petit, Maria. 1996. "Heidegger's Conception of Space," in Macann 1996, 134–58.

Vogel, Lawrence. 1996. *The Fragile 'We': Ethical Implications of Heidegger's Being and Time* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press).

Völker, Ludwig. 1972. "'Gelassenheit': Zur Enstehung des Wortes in der Sprache Meister Eckharts und seiner Überlieferung in der Nacheckhartschen Mystik bis Jacob Böhme," in Franz Hundsnurscher and Ulrich Müller (eds.), *Getempert und Gemischet: Für Wolfgang Mohr zum 65. Geburtstag von seinen Tübinger Schülern* (Göppingen: Alfred Kümmerle), 281–312.

Volpi, Franco. 1996. "Dasein as Praxis: The Heideggerian Assimilation and Radicalization of the Practical Philosophy of Aristotle," in Macann 1996, 27–66.

von Falkenhayn, Katharina. 2003. *Augenblick und Kairos: Zeitlichkeit im Frühwerk Martin Heideggers* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot).

von Herrmann, Friedrich-Wilhelm. 1992. "Way and Method: Hermeneutic Phenomenology in Thinking the History of Being," in Christopher Macann (ed.), *Martin Heidegger: Critical Assessments*, vol. 1 (London: Routledge), 310–29.

2000. *Hermeneutik und Reflexion* (Frankfurt: Klostermann).

2013. *Hermeneutics and Reflection: Heidegger and Husserl on the Concept of Phenomenology*, trans. Kenneth Maly (University of Toronto Press).

von Herrmann, Friedrich-Wilhelm and Francesco Alfieri. 2017. *Die Wahrheit über die Schwarzen Hefte* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot).

Waismann, Friedrich. 1979. *Ludwig Wittgenstein and the Vienna Circle: Conversations Recorded by Friedrich Waismann*, trans. Brian McGuinness and Joachim Schulte (New York: Rowman & Littlefield).

Waldenfels, Bernhard. 2011. *Phenomenology of the Other: Basic Concepts*, trans. T. Stähler and A. Kozin (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press).

Weatherston, Martin. 2002. *Heidegger's Interpretation of Kant: Categories, Imagination, and Temporality* (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan).

Wellbery, David. 2003. "Stimmung," in Karlheinz Barck *et al.* (eds.), *Ästhetische Grundbegriffe: Historisches Wörterbuch in sieben Bänden*, vol. v (Stuttgart: Metzler), 703–33.

White, Carol J. 2005. *Time and Death: Heidegger's Analysis of Finitude*, ed. Mark Ralkowski (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Williams, Bernard. 2002. *Truth and Truthfulness* (Princeton University Press).

Withy, Katherine. 2012. "The Methodological Role of Angst in *Being and Time*," *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 43: 195–211.

2013. "The Strategic Unity of Heidegger's *The Fundamental Concepts of Metaphysics*," *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 51/2: 161–78.

2014. "Situation and Limitation: Making Sense of Heidegger on Thrownness," *European Journal of Philosophy* 22: 61–81.

2015a. "Authenticity and Heidegger's Antigone," *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology* 45: 239–53.

2015b. *Heidegger on Being Uncanny* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press).

2015c. "Owned Emotions: Affective Excellence in Heidegger and Aristotle," in McManus 2015c, 21–36.

2017. "Concealing and Concealment in Heidegger," *European Journal of Philosophy* 25: 1496–513.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. 1958. *Philosophical Investigations*, ed. and trans. G.E.M. Anscombe and Rush Rhees (Oxford: Blackwell).

1993. "A Lecture on Ethics," in his *Philosophical Occasions 1912–1951*, ed. and trans. James C. Klagge and Alfred Nordmann (Indianapolis: Hackett), 36–44.

Wood, David (ed.). 1993. *Of Derrida, Heidegger, and Spirit* (Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press).

Wrathall, Mark A. 1999. "Heidegger and Truth as Correspondence," *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 7/1: 69–88.

2000. "Philosophers, Thinkers and Heidegger's Place in the History of Being," in James E. Faulconer and Mark A. Wrathall (eds.), *Appropriating Heidegger* (Cambridge University Press), 9–29.

2003. "Introduction: Metaphysics and Onto-theology," in Mark A. Wrathall (ed.), *Religion After Metaphysics* (Cambridge University Press), 1–6.

2006. "Truth and the Essence of Truth in Heidegger's Thought," in Guignon 2006b, 241–67.

2011. *Heidegger and Unconcealment: Truth, Language and History* (Cambridge University Press).

(ed.). 2013a. *The Cambridge Companion to Being and Time* (Cambridge University Press).

2013b. "Heidegger on Human Understanding," in Wrathall 2013a, 177–200.

2015a. "'Demanding Authenticity of Ourselves': Heidegger on Authenticity as an Extra-Moral Ideal," in Hans Pedersen and Megan Altman (eds.), *Horizons of Authenticity in Phenomenology, Existentialism, and Moral Psychology* (Dordrecht: Springer), 347–68.

2015b. "Autonomy, Authenticity, and the Self," in McManus 2015, 193–214.

2017a. "Individuation and Heidegger's Ontological 'Intuitionism,'" in Pavlos Kontos and Véronique Fóti (eds.), *Phenomenology and the Primacy of the Political* (New York: Springer), 69–86.

2017b. "Making Sense of Human Existence (Heidegger on the Limits of Practical Familiarity)," in Ondřej Švec and Jakub Čapek (eds.), *Pragmatic Perspectives in Phenomenology* (New York: Routledge), 227–41.

2017c. "Who is the Self of Everyday Existence," in Bernhard Schmid and Gerhard Thonhauser (eds.), *Heidegger and Contemporary Social Theory* (Heidelberg: Springer), 9–28.

2018. "The Task for Thinking in a Technological Age," in Aaron Wendland, Tobias Keiling, and Christopher Merwin (eds.), *Heidegger on Technology* (London: Routledge), 13–38.

Wrathall, Mark A. and Morganna Lambeth. 2011. "Heidegger's Last God," *Inquiry* 54: 160–82.

Xolocotzi, Angel. 2002. *Der Umgang als Zugang: Der hermeneutisch-phänomenologische Zugang zum faktischen Leben in den frühen Freiburger Vorlesungen Martin Heideggers* (Berlin: Duncker & Humblot).

Young, Julian. 1995. "Being and Value: Heidegger Contra Nietzsche," *International Studies in Philosophy* 27: 105–16.

1998. "Death and Authenticity," in Jeff Malpas and Robert Solomon (eds.), *Death and Philosophy* (London: Routledge), 112–19.

2001. *Heidegger's Philosophy of Art* (Cambridge University Press).

2002. *Heidegger's Later Philosophy* (Cambridge University Press).

2015. "Was There a 'Turn' in Heidegger's Philosophy?" in Braver 2015, 329–48.

Zaborowski, Holger. 2011. "Heidegger's Hermeneutics: Towards a New Practice of Understanding," in Daniel O. Dahlstrom (ed.), *Interpreting Heidegger* (Cambridge University Press), 15–41.

Zahavi, Dan. 2004. "Husserl's Noema and the Internalism-Externalism Debate," *Inquiry* 47: 42–66.

2015. *Self and Other: Exploring Subjectivity, Empathy, and Shame* (Oxford University Press).

Zaidman, Louise Bruit and Pauline Schmitt Pantel. 1992. *Religion in the Ancient Greek City*, trans. Paul Cartledge (Cambridge University Press).

Ziarek, Krzysztof. 2002. "Art, Power, and Politics: Heidegger on *Machenschaft* and *Poiesis*," *Contretemps* 3: 175–86.

2011. "Poietic Justice," in Oren Ben-Dor (ed.), *Law and Art: Justice, Ethics, Aesthetics* (New York: Routledge), 33–44.

2014. *Language After Heidegger* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

Ziegler, Susanne. 2014. "Matter Schein: Zu Heideggers Phänomenologie des Unscheinbaren," *Heidegger Studies* 30: 97–108.

Zimmerman, Michael E. 1986. *Eclipse of the Self* (Athens: Ohio University Press).

1990. *Heidegger's Confrontation with Modernity: Technology, Politics, and Art* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press).

2000. "The End of Authentic Selfhood in the Postmodern Age?" in Mark A. Wrathall and Jeff Malpas (eds.), *Heidegger, Authenticity, and Modernity* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press), 123–48.

Žižek, Slavoj. 2009. "Radical Intellectuals, or, Why Heidegger Took the Right Step (Albeit in the Wrong Direction) in 1933," in his *In Defense of Lost Causes* (London: Verso), 148–53.

Index